00051165

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 15 June, 2016

THE

HOME AND AGE OF THE AVESTA.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

Dr. EMIL J. von DILLON,

51165

PROFESSOR AT THE IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY, CHARKOW.

Bombay:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

MANECKJI BURJORJI MINOCHERHOMJI AT THE

"BOMBAY SAMACHAR" PRESS.

1887.

00051165

To

BOMANJEE DINSHAW MANECKJEE PETIT, ESQ., J. P.

FOR THE INTEREST HE TAKES IN

AND

THE SYMPATHY HE EVINCES FOR

THE FURTHERANCE OF RESEARCHES

PERTAINING TO

THE ZOROASTRIAN RELIGION,

THIS TRANSLATION

Is Most Respectfully Dedicated

BY THE EDITOR

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following pages are a translation from the German of an Essay on the Home and Age of the Avesta, written by Dr. Emil J. von Dillon, a distinguished Professor at the University of Charkow, and presented by him to the Oriental Congress which met last year at Vienna. Professor von Dillon's contribution may be regarded as a reply to the remarkable essay of the learned Dr. William Geiger, which was published amongst the "Transactions of the Royal Bavarian Academy" in 1884, under the title of *Vaterland und Zeitalter des Avesta und seiner Kultur.* In this treatise Dr. Geiger endeavours to maintain that the Avesta was originally composed in Eastern Iran, which he regards as the birth-place of the civilization of the Avesta people, and that it was written at a time previous to the existence of the Median and Persian monarchies. The arguments which he advances in support of his theory of the high antiquity of the Avesta are mostly, if not mainly, negative in character, and rest principally on what is termed the silence of the Avesta itself. The Avesta, he says, must have been in existence in a pre-Achaemenian, and very probably in a pre-Median, epoch because it makes no mention of cities famous during the Median period, with the exception of Ragha; it does not speak of any of those tribes or peoples that were commonly known at a later period; and it contains no historical statement concerning the struggles between the Medes and the Babylonians, the rise of the Persians, the prosperity and decline of the Persian Empire, the invasion of Alexander the Great, or of the Kingdoms which originated on the downfall of his Empire.

Although Dr. Geiger's theory has received the assent of several eminent Oriental scholars, there are others no less distinguished who deny the validity of the premisses on which his arguments rest, and dispute the conclusions at which he has arrived. Amongst the most prominent and best known of Dr. Geiger's opponents are found Dr. von Spiegel of the University of Erlangen, who is rightly regarded as the Father of Iranian philology, Dr. Justi of Marburg, and the learned Professor Ch. de Harlez, who occupies the chair of Iranian Literature at the University of Louvain, and who has dealt exhaustively with this question in his writings on Zoroastrian literature. These scholars hold that the Avesta was written by the Magi, and that its composition dates no further back than the time of the Achaemenians. From the internal evidence furnished by the Avesta, as well as the testimony of reliable historical writers, and the information that has come down to us by tradition, they conclude that the high antiquity which has been claimed for it by some Orientalists cannot be maintained, and that, in reality, it is of relatively modern origin.

The views held on this subject by Dr. Spiegel and de Harlez are vigorously defended in Dr. von Dillon's excellent essay. He analyses with much critical acuteness the principal arguments adduced by Dr. Geiger in support of his somewhat novel theory, and addresses himself with especial industry to combat the *argumentum á silentio* to which the author of *Vaterland und Zeitalter des Avesta* attaches so considerable importance. The present Avesta, he points out, is admittedly but a fragment of the original work; it was compiled for a specific purpose—as a book intended for devotional or liturgical pur oses—and it is not to be expected that it will furnish,

except incidentally, information which was quite foreign to the object which its editors had in view. To conclude, as Herr Geiger has done, from the non-mention of certain localities in the Avesta that the volume was composed before such places had an historical existence, Dr. von Dillon considers to be unwarranted: and if the Avesta is silent on certain features in the economic life of the Zarathushtrian people, the explanation is found in the peculiar and definite character of the compilation.

In the first portion of his essay our author replies in considerable detail to what may be termed the geographical objections urged by Dr. Geiger against the Median origin of the Avesta, citing very authoritative testimony in support of the opinion that its home was in Western Iran, and that its authors were Magi; in the second portion he deals more especially with the argument *á silentio*, and shows that such an argument cannot be applied in the case under consideration, and that, consequently, it fails to be serviceable for the purposes of Dr. Geiger's theory.

Dr. von Dillon shows an extensive acquaintance with the various branches of Oriental learning, and his essay will, no doubt, be welcomed by scholars as a valuable contribution to the discussion of a deeply interesting question.

Thanks are due to Mr. T. A. Walsh, Principal of the Institute for Deaf-mutes, Bombay, for his able translation of the original German manuscript of Dr. von Dillon, and to the Trustees of the Sir J. J. Translation Fund for their aid towards the expenses of this publication.

THE HOME AND AGE OF THE AVESTA.

THE question of the Home and the Age of the Avesta has been several times discussed by the leading Iranists, so that we may well admit that the data at our disposal are sufficient to enable us to arrive at a satisfactory result. Here naturally, as in every case in which there is question of the Avesta, the results attained are intimately connected with the method employed by the inquirer. Those scholars who explain the text of the Avesta exclusively with the aid of the Veda and make no account of the local tradition must, at the outset, hold that the Avesta is very ancient, and must seek the Home of the Avesta people in Eastern Iran. No other view harmonizes so readily with their method of explanation. No one will venture to maintain, without further proof, that the religious views of the Veda written in the fifteenth century B. C. in the Panjab are the basis of the Avesta composed a thousand years later in Western Iran. The one hypothesis supposes the other without, however, establishing it. The followers of the Traditional School, on the contrary, avail themselves of every fact which helps to explain the Avesta, and are by no means prejudiced in favour of any preconceived theory respecting the questions which we are about to consider.

If a thorough knowledge of the texts of both the Avesta and the Veda, and the ability to combine ingeniously some statements in themselves unimportant could establish an hypothesis which has no foundation, then all Iranists would

long since have adopted the view defended by Roth, and have declared Bactria to be the Home of the Avesta. It needs, however, no special erudition easily to discover facts which cannot be reconciled with this theory.

De Harlez has made frequent reference to several of these facts, (1) and has contributed much to do away with the term "Old Bactrian" in so far as it was applied to the language and people of the Avesta. But he went still further, and concluded on the authority of these same statements that the Avesta was written by the Magi in the time of the Achaemenians. This well grounded opinion has been generally received by the best known Iranists. (2)

Herr Geiger, in an essay(3) specially devoted to this question, is the first who has attempted to refute the arguments which go to prove the Magian origin of the Avesta and the relatively late period at which it was written. In his essay he endeavours to establish that the soil on which the civilization of the Avesta people grew is essentially East Iranian, and that this civilization goes back to a period antecedent to the time of the Mede and Persian Kings. He has omitted nothing to make his opinion appear probable; all even the most unimportant objections which have been adduced hitherto from various sides against the Median origin of the Avesta are in his essay repeated, and diffusely developed. When Herr

1. Vide *Les Origines du Zoroastrisme*, p. 274 et seq.; *le Calendrier Avestique*, p. 25 et seq.; *Origines de l'Avesta et son interprétation*, passim.

2. Vide Speigel, *Sybels hist. Zeitschr* VIII. 1 et seq. *Z. D. M G.* XXXV 629 et. seq.

3. "*Vaterland und Zeitalter der Avesta und seiner Kulter*" Stzgb. d. phil. classe der K. C. Akademie der Wissench. 1884. H. II. pp. 315—385.

Geiger desires at times to demolish, or at least to weaken, an argument of his opponent, he proposes several contradictory possibilities so that the reader is left a very comprehensive choice. But whether we are to consider the question as definitely solved, and Herr Geiger's solution the only correct one, we shall here more closely inquire.

Herr Geiger commences his interesting inquiry with an exact definition of the expression "Home of the Avesta," by which he understands not merely the province in which the Avesta text was written, but the territory through which Zoroastrism was spread and the Home of the Avesta people generally. In this every one will agree with him, for so far as we are aware nobody will be disposed to regard as synonymous the expressions "Home of the Avesta" and "Province in which the Avesta was written." However, clearness or distinctness, even in the smallest matters, is never superfluous, and Herr Geiger has very properly shown the difference. He further adds with much ingenuity, that even if the Home of Zarathushtra admits of proof, the locality where the Avesta was written is not thereby ascertained with certainty.

The method, however, which Herr Geiger has followed in his inquiry appears to me somewhat too one-sided; he contents himself almost exclusively with the statements of the Avesta, and makes too limited a use of the local tradition and the accounts of the ancients. It is at present generally allowed that our texts are by no means identical with those of the old Avesta;[1] they can at most, as Herr Geiger himself

1. Vide Spiegel, *Z. D. M. G.* XXXV. 638. Geiger, *Vaterland u. Zeitalt. Avesta* 317.

admits,(1) be regarded as a book of devotion for liturgical purposes taken from the great Avesta. It need hardly be pointed out that even if the original Avesta had come down to us, we ourselves would have learned nothing from its pages on many points respecting which we would have desired information, since its authors had in view the religious profit of their co-religionists, and not the gratification of our curiosity. In the detached pieces which have reached us, a great deal is naturally wanting of that which existed in the original Avesta, and especially information which would have been out of place in a devotional work composed for liturgical purposes. But admitting even that such a necessarily incomplete prayer-book contains incidentally some scattered notices and allusions by means of which the Home and the Age of the original Avesta may be conjectured, we are still in no case justified in inferring from its silence any conclusions whatever relative to the state of civilization of the Avesta people. As, in general, we can expect to find but few direct statements in our Avesta touching the questions on which we are employed, we may, in fact we must, in doubtful cases consult tradition. Although Herr Geiger does not expressly object to this principle, he seems not to have followed it, since he draws all his arguments from the notices and from the silence of the Avesta. As we cannot here enter on the so often and so exhaustively discussed question of method, we will proceed at once to discuss the data which can throw any light on the question of the Home of the Avesta.

I.

1. Yasht V. was probably written in Western Iran and certainly in Media or Persia. The worship of Anahita is treated

1. Vide Geiger, *Vaterl. u. Zeitalt. d. Avesta*, p. 317.

of in this Yasht, and this cultus is therein described in such a manner as in Western Iran only it was practised. In Yt. V, 126–129 a statue of Anahita is described, whilst it was by Artaxerxes II statues were first introduced. As is well known temples to the honour of this goddess were erected in many countries; we hear, for example, of such temples in Hierocæsarea, in Susa, in Pontian Cappadocia, in Armenia, in Persia and in Media, but from the passages quoted by Windischmann[1] it follows that the Anahita-cultus had its seat chiefly in Persia and Media.

That this goddess was generally honoured in the East also is not probable; at all events it cannot be proved. Clemens Alexandrinus, who appeals to Berosus mentions, it is true, a statue of Anahita in Bactria also, but this proves nothing for the worship of Anahita in that country, for from this passage it only follows that Artaxerxes II. had set up a statue to the honour of Anahita in Bactria, and made the attempt to introduce into Bactria the Persian mode of honouring the goddess; but it is nowhere related that in Eastern Iran, and especially in Bactria, the Anahita-cultus had thriven and had taken deep root as it had done in Persia and Media. We are therefore fully justified in concluding that Yasht V and all the other passages in which the worship of Anahita is described were written in Western Iran and probably in Media.

2. The Avestic priests or Atharvans belonged to the race of the Magi, and consequently were descended from the Medes. In my opinion a glance at the passages collected by De Harlez from the classical writers of antiquity is sufficient to place this

1. *Die Persische Anahita oder Anaïtis.*

statement beyond any doubt.(1) . Almost in every case where the name of Zoroaster occurs in them he is described as a Magus. The dogmas and customs which characterize the Avestic system of religion, are by them commonly ascribed to the Magi. Hence it follows that amongst the Sasanides as soon as the Avesta religion became the religion of the State, its priests are Magi, and as such are described by all. Finally Strabo translates the Avestic Atharvan by the word *Puraithos* which corresponds most closely to the Avestic word.(2) Moreover, the word *Maghu* occurs in the Avesta, (Yasna LXV, 6). and must be translated by the word Magus as the Pehlvi version renders it by *Mogu*, and explains it by *Moggabra*. That the Magi were descended from the Medes is not, so far as I know, contested by any one, and follows clearly from such passages as Herod. I. 101, 102, 120; III, 65,73, and Ammianus Marcellinus XXIII, 6, 31, 32.

It appears from the traditions that the Median Atharvans preached and propagated the Zarathushtrian doctrine in the Eastern provinces of Iran, for it is evident from several passages of the Avesta that they travelled about the country.(3) Later on also,—in the time of the Sasanides very many Magi were sent by Yezdigerd to Armenia for the purpose of converting the Armenian Christians to the State religion.(4)

---

1. See *Introduction* p. CLXXXIX et seq.

2. XV. 733. See Windischmann, *Zor. St.* 296; De Harlez, *Introd.* CXCI; *Origines de l'Avesta et son interprétation*, 3.

3. Vide Yasna XLII 6: IX, 24.

4. See Elisäus III. 14. It may here be remarked that Elisäus understood by the term Magi simple followers of the Zoroastrian religion.

But it is not thereby proved that the whole of the Avesta was written in Western Iran or that its Home was limited to Western Iran, for some portions of the Avesta were undoubtedly written in the East, and that Eastern Iran also belonged to the Zarathushtrian countries is easily shown. I mean only to say that Western Iran, and particularly Media, is to be considered as the especial home of the Zarathushtrian faith, and that consequently we can no longer speak of the civilization of the Avestic people as being exclusively East Iranian.

3. The legends contained in the Avesta belong, as Spiegel has shown, if not exclusively, at least principally, to the Northern Iranians, and the East Iranian hero Rustem is nowhere mentioned in the Avesta.(1)

4. It is not to be denied that Media exercised a considerable influence on the other Iranian races, not alone in regard to matters of religion, but in respect to civilization, in its widest sense, as well. To give only one illustration:—the Median method of arming was adopted amongst the majority of the Iranian people of antiquity. In this respect—to judge by what Herodotus tells us—the Hyrcanians, the Kissians, the Sogdians, the Chorasmians and the Bactrians did not escape the Median influence.(2)

5. The persecutions to which reference is made in the Gâthâs are certainly no other than the persecutions of the Magi by Darius which naturally took place in Western Iran.

6. According to the report of Herodotus(3) intermarriages were first introduced by Cambyses. That the Median Magi

1. See Spiegel, *Z. D. M. G.* XXXV. 641.

2. See Herodotus, VII. 66.

3. Herod. III. 31.

should have quietly admitted such a desirable innovation in their religion, made by a Persian King is easily understood; they showed themselves in other circumstances sufficiently complying to the spirit of the time, that we need not in the least wonder at their yielding in this matter. It is *possible* that the statement in Herodotus has been an invention of his own in order to give a plausible explanation to a custom which appeared strange to him; but without solid grounds we cannot be expected to deny it any historical value. As until now no important objections have been brought forward against its credibility, we are disposed to maintain that the Avesta passages Yasna XII. 9, Gah. IV. 8, Visp. III. 3, Vend. VIII. 13, have been written in Western Iran, or at least directly under West Iranian influence.

7. According to the Avesta Zarathushtra was active in Western Iran,(1) which seems to me equivalent to saying that the religious reform of Zarathushtra spread from the beginning in Western Iran. I need hardly observe that the Parsi Zoroastrian legends completely confirm these passages of the Avesta.

8. In Yasna XIX. 18. Ragha in Media is unquestionably described as Zarathushtrian, and Zarathushtra appears as the spiritual and at the same time the temporal Lord of the country. If we now compare with this important and frequently discussed passage of the Avesta the gloss to Yasna LX. 3, it will be evident that Ragha was the seat of the highest Mobed dignity, and that the successors of Zarathushtra inherited both the spiritual and temporal authority. This inference appears from the Vend. I, 16, where Ragha receives the epithet "con-

1. See Yasht IX, 25; V. 104.

tisting of three communities," and the local explanation confirms it. If, finally, we compare the Avesta-texts and Glosses with the account of Alberunis, according to which the ruler of the Magi—Maç-Moghan—had always the dignity of a Prince of the Persian empire, and possessed a territory of his own, whose decline Yaqut describes, we shall be able to form an idea of the significant *rôle* which, according to the statements of the Avesta, Ragha played amongst Zarathushtrian countries.(1) This important *rôle* we cannot possibly ascribe to accident or chance; it stands undoubtedly in strict connection with the position which from the commencement Media assumed with reference to the Zarathushtrian reform. The question whether Zarathushtra originally preached his doctrine in Western Iran, and later on spread it in the Eastern provinces, remains for the present open to discussion. It is certain that the new religion found many zealous disciples in the West, during the life-time of the Prophet, and that even at a very early period the principal seat of the Zarathushtrian priesthood was in Media.

9. The religious system of the Avesta consists, in my opinion, of two different and not always easily distinguishable doctrinal parts,—the common Iranian, pre-Zarathushtrian views and usages, and the specific Zarathushtrian. If we now carefully analyse the most highly esteemed Zarathushtrian dogmas and religious usages, and even some pre-Zarathushtrian views, and endeavour to fix their origin, we readily arrive at the conviction that it is only in Western Iran they can have had their origin. I need not further enter on this question; I

1. On this point compare de Harlez, *Introd.* CLXXXIX et seq. and Spiegel *Z. D. M. G.* p. 629 et seq.

think it sufficient to refer to the investigations of Spiegel[1] and de Harlez.[2]

10. We should not, I believe, attach too much importance to the geographical information furnished by the Avesta, nor should we draw from it any weighty conclusions for determining the Home of the Avesta. The names of countries and cities occur but incidentally in the Avesta, for, with the aim which the writers and editors had in view, they have properly nothing in common; consequently we cannot, from the mention or non-mention of the names of certain countries, draw any broad inferences. If, however, we examine the geographical facts of the Avesta, we shall find that they afford a striking proof of the prominent position which Western Iran held amongst the Zarathushtrian countries.

These will, probably, be the most important arguments that can be brought forward for the leading part which Western Iran played in the rise and development of Zoroastrianism. There are yet other less important facts which I here intentionally pass over, because they but serve to corroborate those already adduced. If we now put together the results of all these considerations, we may definitely affirm that the more considerable portion of the Avesta was written in Western Iran, and most probably in Media, and that the specific Zarathushtrian doctrine, at least in its essential parts, has directly originated under West Iranian influence. With this conclusion the greater number of inquirers have expressed their concurrence, for in accepting it nothing is admitted for

1. *Eran Alterth.* I, 449 et seq.; II. 171 et seq.

2. *Des Origines des Zoroastrisme*, 271 et seq.

which the data adduced does not afford proof, or which is contradictory to the other statements of the Avesta. Herr Geiger, of course, thinks otherwise. In his opinion the foregoing arguments are not tenable, whilst in his view other important arguments appear to indicate that not Western Iran, but Eastern Iran can claim the honour of being regarded as the territory of the Zarathustrian religion.

1. Against the first argument which, indeed, has been hitherto advanced in a somewhat anomalous form, Herr Geiger remarks that the order of Artaxerxes II., if it really effected the introduction of the worship of Anahita, concerned the Persians particularly, but not the Magi, who already for centuries might have possibly honoured their Anahita. But as regards the description of the Anahita, it appears to him more probable that the later statues of Anahita were erected in accordance with these descriptions, than the reverse. "Every picture," Herr Geiger tells us, "must first exist in the idea before it can be plastically executed" (381.) We suppose that de Harlez knew this also before; he will nevertheless not have known that an image in order to exist in the imagination and to be capable of being subsequently executed plastically, must have been centuries before depicted in religious song. But when we wish to give expression to a conception of a picture that has never yet been plastically executed, we ordinarily commence our description not with the words "which stand for it, (1)" for to Herr Geiger this expression explains itself sufficiently through the vivacity and realism of the whole description. Others, however, will consider this explanation as too ingenious, if only one example for so rhetorical a figure can be discovered in the whole Avesta!

1. Ya histaiti.

With reference to Artaxerxes II., he did not, unless I am mistaken, introduce the worship of Anahita but a new phase thereof, and amongst other innovations caused statues to be erected. But if it is true that his religious zeal for the worship of this goddess was confined to the particular limits of Persia and did not extend to the neighbouring Provinces, wherefore does Herr Geiger connect the incidental description of the Anahita given in the Yt. V. 126-129, with the statues of this goddess? It is certain that in Yt. V. 126-129 we have a simple description of an existing statue, and not of a conception to be yet plastically executed, and although strictly speaking this description may equally apply to a statue erected in Bactria by the same Artaxerxes, it is, however, most improbable, for this Yasht can only have been written at a time and at a place where the Anahita-cultus had attained its highest point. We have the most various and most trustworthy testimony for the extraordinary spread of the Anahita worship in the West where it was particularly at home, whilst, so far as I am aware, we know nothing or almost nothing of its development in the Eastern Provinces of Iran. Not merely have we no occasion to seek in the East the place where this Yasht was composed, but we are unquestionably necessitated to locate it in the West; and not only this passage but all other passages of the Avesta which treat of the Anahita-cultus here described or which presuppose it.

2. Herr Geiger is equally unsuccessful in the solitary objection which he brings forward against the second argument. Although he willingly allows that the Magi were, in historical times, the defenders of the Zarathushtrian re-

ligion, it appears to him very far from following that they were the authors of the Avesta with which we are familiar. This can only be one of three possibilities; the remaining two are (2) the Magi received the doctrine of the Zarathushtrian priests and defended a later development of the Avesta religion; (3) the Zarathushtrian priests are the heirs of the Magi. This last possibility Herr Geiger advances only to reject it immediately, since it cannot be reconciled with the most authentic historical facts.

The principal objection against the first "possibility" consists, according to Herr Geiger, in the fact that the Avesta makes mention of the Atharvans but not of the Magi. If the Atharvans were really Magi, why did they not take their peculiar name? Why did they always describe themselves by their official title, Atharvan? I do not understand how the answer to this question has not occurred to Herr Geiger, who in other cases is careful to reason so ingeniously. If, as he admits, even from the time of the Achaemenians,—we may say in round numbers for a thousand years,—the Magi had been the priests of the Zoroastrian religion, and if further they several times revised and codified the Avesta, how does it happen that they never call themselves by their honourable names, but have been invariably content with their official designation of Atharvan. Thus we see that the objection, if it is to have any value, tells as well against the "possibility" defended by Herr Geiger as against our acceptation.

The procedure of the Magi has, however, been long since explained. Atharvan was the old Iranian—not merely the old Zarathushtrian—name of the priest, and was retained even after the Zarathushtrian reform. The word Magi indicated, not

perhaps a title, but a Median origin, and on that account was not employed for the purpose of denoting the priests. But even if it were otherwise, an *argumentum a silentio* could not be here advanced. The word Atharvan does not occur even once in the Gâthâs; are we on that account justified in concluding that the Gâthâs were composed all at the one time, when there were no priests and the word Atharvan had not yet existed? Certainly not; for the word Atharvan is really the old Iranian and pre-Zarathushtrian title of the priest which the followers of Zarathushtra retained. As is well known, the Roman Catholic Church is constantly denoted as "Roman"; are we for that reason authorized to hold as invalid a Papal document in which the Church does not receive this epithet? In the proto-canonical portion of the Book of Esther, the name of God does not occur on a single occasion; nobody, however, will thence draw the conclusion that the author was an atheist. Strabo, as we have seen, says that the Magi called themselves *Puraithoi* that is to say Atharvans; if, then, they did so in historical times, and if they never called themselves by their honourable titles, they may have acted so from the beginning. To this may be added the Magian hatred of the Persians, which, in and by itself, sufficed to effect the total suppression of the designation Magus even if it had been correctly employed.

Notwithstanding all this and as if for the satisfaction of those who would not be content with anything less than the occurrence of the word in our Texts, the word *Maghu*(1)

1. Herr Geldner has lately explained this word as the member of a *Maga*, some one of a band or of a confederacy *K. Z.* XXVIII, p. 201. This explanation is more ingenious than well-founded.

actually occurs in Yaçna, LXV., 6. But this passage is far from satisfying Herr Geiger, for to him it proves at most that "at the time of its composition the expression *Maghu* was known, and very possibly had as *honourable* a signification as the word priest." What this "honourable" signification may have been, Herr Geiger does not inform us; he seeks instead to offer proof that the expression Atharvan is more ancient than *Maghu* and dates back from Aryan primitive times. "Everything," he continues, "goes to show that Atharvan was the oldest and most primitive title of the Zarathushtrian priesthood" (377). In my opinion nothing is to be objected against this statement; I go still further, and venture the opinion that Atharvan was not only the oldest, but the only official title of the Zarathushtrian priest, but it does not thence follow that before the Magi there were other non-Median Zarathushtrian priests. (1) We are, on the contrary, led to conclude that the Magi were, from the commencement, the only Zarathushtrian priests. For his acceptation Herr Geiger nowhere brings forward, I will not say an important argument, but even the shadow of an argument.

3. and 4. The non-mention in the Avesta of the East Iranian hero Rustem is nowhere alluded to by Herr Geiger in his Essay, although he appeals so often to the Iranian legends

1. In his "*Osteranischen Kultus,*" Herr Geiger expresses himself on this question as follows: "Under these circumstances it must certainly be admitted that the conjecture which supposes the Atharvans to be no other than Magi, so widely had they been scattered over Eastern Iran, naturally suggests itself. That they received or assumed in Eastern Iran another title than in their own country and in Persia *is not surprising. In any case, all that we know of the Magi accords completely with what is recorded of the Atharvans* (p. 491.)

in support of his views. He has just as little to say of the influence which Media formerly exercised on the other Iranian races including the Eastern.

5. Herr Geiger denies that the persecutions to which the Gâthâs sometimes allude refer to the persecutions of the Magi by Darius; for this view "is contradicted by the whole tone and contents of the Gâthâs." In his opinion, the struggle between Darius and the Magi turned on the question of power, whilst the opposition described in the Gâthâs refers to two epochs in the economic history of the people. To be convinced of the correctness of this explanation it is sufficient to read with attention the XXIX. Chapter of the Yaçna. Herr Geiger in further developing his view analyses Yaçna XXIX. and brings into prominence the great importance which is therein ascribed to the Cow.

In these developments Herr Geiger appears to have overlooked the fact that only a small portion of the Magi will have troubled themselves about the question of power. This struggle interested not the Magi exclusively, but all Median races collectively. If the Magi drew on themselves the anger of Darius in a greater degree than the other Medes, this circumstance is explained by the consequences of the commotion caused by the false Bardiya who belonged to the Magian race. That at the same time a struggle took place amongst other races,—between the nomads and the settled portion of the population—is not called in question by anybody. The one, nevertheless, does not exclude the other. Various passages of the Avesta speak for both, passages which can hardly be otherwise explained. Amongst these passages Herr Geiger selects Yaçna XXIX. in order to show that the

question is not one of power, but of a struggle between nomads and shepherds. But he has given himself unnecessary trouble, for so far as I am aware, no one will venture to maintain that this passage points to the persecutions of the Magi by Darius, to which refer, amongst others, Yaçna XLVI. and Yaçna XLIX. Herr Geiger should have explained in a few words to what persecutions these passages allude, if not to the persecutions of the Magi.

6. Herr Geiger disposes very summarily of the statement of Herodotus, according to which intermarriage was first introduced by Cambyses. He believes that this account "bears quite an anecdotal character," and consequently we cannot insist much on it. Herr Geiger will hardly expect us to accept his belief, however sincere it may be, as a valid argument for the unreliability of the fact mentioned by Herodotus, since history affords us more than one analogy to this statement. It is not always advisable to pass so lightly over the objection of an opponent, for we thus expose ourselves to the danger of overlooking or forgetting many things which we should have kept carefully in view. As Herr Geiger aimed principally at despatch in his reply to de Harlez' objection, he does not appear to have even once referred to the passage in Herodotus, contenting himself with the quotation made by de Harlez. Owing to a typographical error it runs in de Harlez as follows: (*Introd.* CXCIII.) "Herod. III. 34," and Herr Geiger quotes the passage so, although it is actually III. 31.

7. Herr Geiger denies any argumentative value to the statements in the Avesta, according to which Zarathushtra laboured in Western Iran, because he regards Airyana-Vaeja

where the Iranian reformer is said to have been, as a mythical country;—" the mythical character of 'Airyana-Vaidscha is evident from the fact that in the Avesta it passes as the abode of Ahura-Mazda " (p. 322.) Must we, then, on that account dismiss Airyana-Vaeja from our consideration and give up all attempt at fixing its position? By no means, for in the next page, 323, Herr Geiger draws the following conclusion: " It may, therefore, be generally proper if we seek it (i. e. Airyana-Vaeja) in higher or upper Ferghanah." We have then the choice; either we are content with the position of Airyana-Vaeja in upper Ferghana which would be quite satisfactory, for this view can be scientifically established; or, on the contrary, we must regard it as a mythical country, and its position as unascertainable, a view which will certainly be quite as scientific. It is evidently impossible for us to regard this conclusion, or rather these conclusions, as satisfactory; to the question of the position of Airyana-Vaeja I shall return later on. I might only previously observe how closely the statements of the Avesta referring to the activity of Zarathushtra in the West, agree with those of tradition, and with the greater number of the accounts we have from the ancients. I do not propose to enter on the consideration of the traditional statements whose importance for the solution of this and similar questions has been repeatedly admitted, the more particularly as Herr Geiger appears to attach no especial weight to them: I refer only to the exhaustive discussions of Spiegel, (*Eran Alt.* I. 676 et seq.); de Harlez, (*Introd.* XXIII. et seq.) and Windischmann, (*Zor. Stud.* 47 et seq.)

8. Herr Geiger admits that Ragha does not belong to Eastern Iran, but, as is evident, his conclusion is not thereby in

the least strengthened; he adds as follows: "But it (i.e. Ragha) lies close to the natural bridges which connect Western with Eastern Iran. If then all the other localities lie in Eastern Iran, we are certainly entitled notwithstanding this one—Ragha—to speak of an East Iranian civilization ... ... Under all the circumstances, it will be allowed that the name Eastern Iran is more suitable than Northern Iran. Atropatene must, however, belong to the latter. Haetumat, Harahvati, Pisana, Vaekeret—pure Avestic names—which doubtless belong to the present Afghanistan, can never be reckoned as parts of Northern Iran." (1) But if the occurrence of names of localities decidedly East Iranian suffices to prove the inexactness of the expression "Northern Iran," the same argument may be reversed, and the mention of West Iranian localities be employed against the name Eastern Iran. Thus if the name "Nothern Iran" is incorrect, it is hardly worth while contesting that "Eastern Iran" is also inadmissible on the score of inaccuracy. It would, therefore, be labour lost to attempt a collection of names for all the Avestic countries. That Northern Iran especially is no geographical conception I may grant, without, for that reason, being obliged to allow the expressions Eastern and Western Iran; for the geographical divisions of a country are not always identical with its political or even its religious divisions, and in Iran less so than elsewhere.

We can, however, no longer speak of Ragha as the only Avestic province lying in Western Iran, firstly, because, as will subsequently appear, others also are expressly mentioned in the Avesta, and because it is impossible that Ragha can be the

1. 319, 320.

only Avestic region which is not situated in Eastern Iran, for the neighbouring localities lying somewhat to the east of Ragha will not be regarded as belonging to Eastern Iran. To the west of Ragha we may at the outset expect to find Avestic countries, for Ragha was not surrounded by a Chinese wall which could hinder the Avestic religion from spreading to a wider circuit,—and from such passages as Yaçna XLII. 6, Yt. XVI. 17 it appears that the Zoroastrian priests made every exertion to increase the number of their disciples. Even in the 5th century of our era, the same spirit of proselytism appears as one of the characteristic marks of the Zoroastrian Church. Thus it is obvious to conjecture that the religious reform of Zarathushtra may, even from the beginning, have spread to the countries situated to the west of Ragha. This conjecture receives a striking confirmation from the celebrated list of countries to which Herr Geiger attaches so much importance. It will then clearly appear that there are yet other countries besides the sixteen mentioned in the list.(1)

This passage should serve as a warning to those particularly who seek to establish the Home of the Avesta people on the basis of the localities expressly mentioned in the Avesta, without any reference to those on which the Avesta is silent. As is well known the names of Ecbatana, Susa, Pasargada &c. occur nowhere in the Avesta. To conclude from this circumstance that they had not yet existed at the time when the Avesta was composed(2) appears, to me at least, hasty. It should, I think, be understood that the omission of the names of these localities which is sufficiently explained by the principal aim which the

1. Vend. I. 2.

2. See Geiger, *Vaterl. u. Zeitalt. d. Avesta*, 342.

author of the original Avesta had in view, and the fragmentary condition of our present Texts, can by no means be regarded as a result of the non-existence of the cities in question. The passage occurring at the end of the list of countries does not permit us to employ such an *argumentum a silentio*, as its author expressly assures us that he knew of other countries which he would certainly have mentioned if he had considered it necessary to do so.

Herr Geiger seeks, however, to diminish or to explain away the significance of this important passage. "There are other places," he says "of which the concluding passage says nothing. These places might according to the conjecture of the writer have been located in Eastern Iran."(1) Certainly, but they might quite as well have been situated in Western Iran, and if so, there can be no longer question of an exclusively East Iranian civilization, and of one single Avesta country lying in Western Iran. I am convinced that the author here wished to allude directly to the West Iranian localities because the East Iranian were already pretty fully enumerated.

The age of this passage does not in the least change its significance; for either it was written by one of the authors of the great Avesta, and in that case, it proves that it was not his intention to mention all the Avestic countries;—or it may be ascribed to the later editors, and if so, it must be understood that the complete enumeration existed in the original Avesta, but that the editors considered it superfluous to embody it in the Prayer-book, that is to say, our present Avesta. But as long as the proof has not been afforded—and there is yet ample

1. See Geiger, *Vaterl. u. Zeitalt d. Avesta*, p. 322.

time to wait before it can be furnished—that the other places which it leaves unmentioned belong to Eastern Iran, we are hardly justified in maintaining that amongst other places "the greater part of Media," and all Atropatene also, lay "outside the horizon of the Avesta people."(1) The principal seat of the Zarathushtrian priesthood was in Media; Ragha was the Rome of the Zoroastrians, and if, notwithstanding, the great mass of the Medes did not profess the Zoroastrian religion, and the greater portion of Media was situated outside the limits of the Avesta people, we are fallen upon an historical puzzle whose solution, which promises to be of great interest, must first be discovered before we can declare Eastern Iran to have been the Home of the Avesta.

9. Herr Geiger does not enter on the interesting question as to the elements of the Zarathushtrian doctrine, whose discussion must have thrown some light on that concerning the Home of the Avesta. Nor has his attempt to compare the Zoroastrian dogmas with the dogmas of other Eastern religions, and to define their mutual relations, contributed to establish his theory.

It hardly needs to be proved that Zoroastrianism can lay no claim to be considered as a homogeneous system. It consists rather of several strata which can still in part be recognised and chronologically arranged, and whose various phases of development can with great probability be determined. We must pronounce Mazda-cultus the stratum immediately preceding Zoroastrianism, in case we admit that still in the 5th century before Christ the Persian religion was not identical with Zoroastrianism. There is now no doubt that

1. Geiger, *Vaterl. u. Zeitalt d. Avesta* p. 320

neither Zoroastrianism nor Mazda-cultus can have been evolved from the original Iranian religion.

From a careful investigation of their elements it appears that they are simple fruits of a foreign scion which was engrafted on the stock of the old Iranian religion. Certain views and doctrines foreign to the old Iranians which, once introduced into Iran, were fashioned and developed according to the Iranian genius, thus receiving a peculiar character, constituted the principal part of both—but more especially of Zoroastrianism. But notwithstanding the efforts of the reformers these foreign elements did not entirely suppress the old Iranian deities and cultus, nor yet were they able to assimilate with them into a homogeneous whole; the old deities, usages, and beliefs to which the people still remained faithful, formed so to say, only the shell;—the new doctrines constituted the kernel.

No one will venture to maintain that these foreign elements of the Zarathushtrian religion were first introduced into Eastern Iran, and that from thence they spread towards the West. It is much more certain that the originals of the new elements which Zoroastrianism recognised, belonged in the first instance, to the West, so that the conjecture irresistibly forces itself on impartial inquirers that the Zoroastrian religion can have had its origin only in Western Iran. I might here mention some illustrations of this contact of Zoroastrianism with the religions of the West. Combinations such as *Qareno* with (Heb.) *Kabod Adonai*, *Haurvatat* and *Ameretat* with (Semit.) *Harut* and *Marut*; I pass over as uncertain the Fravashi-cultus with the strikingly analogous views current in Sumer, and content myself with referring

to the examples of *Zrvân akarana* and the ancient Bel of the Babylonians, Miçvana and the Semitic views of the treasury existing in the sixth heaven—Machon; the eternal darkness (*anaghra temâo*) and the Babylonian unending darkness—mother of the world; Anahita and the Babylonian Mylitta; the formal exorcisms of the Vendidad and the Sumerian; Anrômainyus and the Biblical Satan; the creation of the world out of nothing and the Hebrew monotheism; the prophets of the Avesta—even of the Gâthâs—and the prophets of the Hebrews, the moral dualism of the Zoroastrians and that of the Hebrews, &c.[1]

10. I pass now to the last point. The geographical statements of the Avesta afford Herr Geiger the principal proofs for his view respecting the Home of that work, and at the same time all his objections against the opposite opinion. Before I examine more closely these scattered notices, I think it is desirable to show the significance of the arguments which are based on them, for it appears to me that Herr Geiger exaggerates their importance. I consider it from the outset improbable—and in this I believe there will be no difference of opinion amongst unprejudiced inquirers—that a Prayer-book taken from the more voluminous sacred writings for an *ex-professo* liturgical purpose, will give us information with reference to the country and the people for whom these sacred writings were originally composed. This is easily understood, for such communications are quite foreign to the immediate object of such a Prayer-book. I believe it necessary to observe further, that if here and there some authentic geographical notices are to be found, they furnish argument

1. Compare Spiegel, *Erân. Alt.* II. 4 et seq. de Harlez, *Origines du Zoroastrisme.* 281 et seq.

only for those fragments of the Avesta in which they occur, for as the West Iranians as well as the East Iranians professed the Zarathushtrian faith, it may evidently well happen that a favourite fragment of the Avesta was written in the East, without its being thereby proved that every other was likewise composed in the East.

Finally, it is to be remarked that when there is question of determining the value of doubtful geographical statements in the Avesta, the same criterion should be employed throughout; we are not to hold as mythical, and consequently of no value, a notice which appears to be antagonistic to a favourite theory for reasons which we would not regard as sufficient to invalidate a passage confirmatory of the theory in question. I do not know if Herr Geiger will agree with me in this,—at least, it seems to me that he has not always kept this rule in view. The following will serve as an illustration. At page 322 he declares Airyana-Vaedscha to be mythical. "The mythical character of Airyana-Vaedscha" he tells us, "is manifest from the fact that it passes in the Avesta as the abode of Ahura Mazda," 322. This circumstance then fully proves the mythical character of Airyana-Vaedscha. But, on the other hand, at page 330-331, Herr Geiger endeavours to fix the position of Hara-Berezaiti without expressing the slightest suspicion of its mythical character. Nevertheless it is on the summit of Hara-Berezaiti, which, by the way, is said to be the first mountain that appeared on the earth (Yt. XIX. 1,) that a vast habitation was erected to Mithra by Ahura Mazda and Amesha-çpentas Yt. X. 50. Does it not follow from this that Hara-Berezaiti has quite as mythical a character as Airyana-Vaedscha? And yet Herr Geiger takes no account of this circumstance, but considers Hara-Berezaiti as little

mythical as Bâkhdi. I need not point out the arbitrariness of this procedure.

Amongst the names of localities mentioned in the Avesta we shall find, as soon as we seriously endeavour to ascertain their position, that many of them bear an exclusively mythical character. I do not mean thereby to assert that this mythical character proves by itself that they have not also designated actual localities, for the one statement is easily reconciled with the other. I mean only to say that their exclusive application as designations of mythical localities, without our possessing any means which would render it possible for us to determine their position approximately, justifies us in making no account whatever of such names of places. Herr Geiger confidently appeals to the great number of places in Western Iran which are mentioned in the Avesta, and believes this proportion sufficient to put beyond doubt the Eastern origin of the Avesta. "It is really difficult to dispute with any one to whom this numerical proportion is not satisfactory. In my opinion it speaks so plainly for Eastern Iran as the Home of the Avesta people that further proof appears hardly necessary."(1) We shall see presently how it particularly stands with this proportion.

Of the list of mountains found in Yasht XIX. 1 et seq., I take no account whatever in what follows, as Herr Geiger describes it as "nearly worthless" (p. 323) "because as regards most of these mountains nothing can be stated in determining their position." If I understand him rightly, Herr Geiger recognizes the Avesta itself as the only means by which the names of places occurring in that work can be

1, p 325; 2, p. 323 et seq.

ascertained; the tradition of the Bundehesh has no value in his eyes, or so little, that unless it be supported by other weighty proofs it possesses no argumentative importance. The passage runs as follows: " I do not attach much value to the geographical statements of the Bundehesh, because this work exhibits a system of the world of which *no trace* is found in the Avesta " (323). I am satisfied with mentioning this judgment as a fact which will simplify the course of this discussion, without further disputing its accuracy.

The number of places quoted by Herr Geiger, irrespective naturally of the list of mountains spoken of above, extends to fifty: (1) Aîryana-Vaeja, Dâitya, Dareja, Çughdha, Gâu, Qâirizem, Rañhâ, Gudha, Ardviçûra-Anâhita, Hara-Berezaiti, Taêra, Hukairya, Kañha, Vaeçka, Kshathro-Çaoka, Vouru-Kasha, Mouru, Bakhdhi, Niçaya, Haraêva, Vâitigaêça, Vaêkereta, Urva, Harahvati, Haêtumañt, Vehrkâna, Khneñta, Varena, Chakhra, Ragha, Piçana, Hapta-hindvô, Kãçoya, Chaêchaçta Frazdânava, Huçrava, Vañhazdâo, Awzdânava, Usidâo, Ushidarena, Arezûra, Maênakha, Erezifya, Vîtañuhaiti, Bawri, Kviriñta, Pouruta, Iskata, Açnavañt, and Kaoiriça. Of these, seventeen now belong to the East and more especially to the north-east: Çughdha, Gâu, Qârizem, Mouru, Bâkhdhi, Niçaya, Haraêva, Vâitigaeça, Vaêkereta, Harahvati, Haetumañt, Piçana, Hapta-hindavô, Kãçoya, Ushidâo, and perhaps Rañhâ and Gudha. In the opinion of Herr Geiger it is impossible to establish the position of the six following:—Vañhazdâo, Awzdânava, Vîtañuhaiti, Maênakha, Erezifya, Arezûra. I pass over Ardvi-Çûra because I regard it as indeterminable, and because Herr Geiger does not appeal to it. So far I agree fully with Herr Geiger; with reference to the position of the other places I must, however, differ from him. In the first instance I may

1. p. 323, et seq.

observe that his geographical expressions leave much to be desired in the matter of accuracy. In his opinion Iran extends to the East at least as far as 77° (from Greenwich) and places which are situated not more easterly than 53° are yet considered by him as belonging to Eastern Iran. It may be asked on what grounds Herr Geiger reckons as part of Eastern Iran, Vehrkâna which lies between 54° and 57.° Vehrkâna and consequently Khneñta also are situated, so far as I am aware, in the North-West, and indeed in the neighbourhood of the North-Western angles of Iran, and no impartial inquirer will maintain that they belong to Eastern Iran. Herr Geiger himself, not long since, reckoned Vehrkâna as belonging to the Western province of old Iran,(1) and I fail to see how it can now be counted amongst the provinces of Eastern Iran. That Qâirizem is situated in the North, and not in the East, is self-evident; Varena is in the North West of Iran, so that in no case do they belong to Eastern Iran.(2) Perhaps Chakhra also belongs to the North-West, as Herr Geiger asserts, but the grounds for this view do not seem to me satisfactory. Herr Geiger's theory respecting the Home of the Avesta is hardly made more probable by the fact that he at present designates as East Iranian what he formerly re-

---

1. Certainly not expressly, but we cannot explain the passage otherwise: it runs as follows: "It is, moreover, worthy of remark that whilst the *other Western Provinces* of Old Iran stand at the close of the list of countries in the Vendidad, Vehrkâna finds its place between Urva and Harahvati. Accordingly its position has been quite independent of the other districts in the *West*" *Ostiran Kult.* p. 125.

2. This view has also been defended by Herr Geiger, *Ostiran Kult.* p. 127.

garded as West Iranian. We can, of course, very easily change the nomenclature, but the positions of the provinces or districts still remain the same.

Chaechaçta, Huçrava and Açnavañt.

As is well known the Chaêchaçta and Hucrava seas which are sometimes mentioned close to each other in the Avesta,(1) are not situated far apart. Chaêchaçta has been hitherto identified with the Urumia sea in Adarbaijan because the statements of the Avesta as well as the testimony of tradition appear to point to this conclusion. Herr Geiger, however, cannot coincide with this view, because it stands in contradiction with the assertion made by him (p. 338) according to which the names of places occurring in the Avesta lie "*without exception within the limits of the list of countries given.*" In consequence of which he goes to the trouble of proposing some entirely superfluous conjectures which he is by no means in a position to establish, and which rest on a mere "*perhaps.*" I call them superfluous, because the earlier received view is, in itself, most probable : Herr Geiger admits that the identification of Chaêchaçta with the sea of Urumia "is not impossible," but adds immediately afterwards : "perhaps we may admit as in the case of Bawri, that it did not lie within the country of the old Iranians ; *because in effect it lies at quite a considerable distance to the West* from the Province, which *moreover* forms its extreme limit or boundary. But perhaps Tschaitschasta is a passing name which first at a later time was given to the Urumia."(2) But why need we have recourse to such random conjectures ? Perhaps the circumstance that the Urumia sea overpassed its former

1. Compare Siroz. I. 9 ; II. 9 ; Nyâish. V, 5.

2. *Vaterl. und Zeitalt. d. Avesta*, 323.

boundaries in the West? But who has fixed these limits? Herr Geiger himself tells us that they can only be determined on the strength of the statements of the Avesta. Since Chaêchaçta is mentioned with relative frequency in the Avesta as a sea situated in Iran, we cannot assert that a country lying more to the West, is the extreme boundary in the West, before we have determined the position of Chaêchaçta itself.

Herr Geiger, however, has not yet exhausted his conjectures. Some pages further he enquires: "How would it be if we considered the Issyk-kul? (1) If the former (i. e. Chaêchaçta) is the Issyk-kul, then the latter (i. e. Huçrava) is undoubtedly the Ison-kul; if, on the contrary, the former is the Urumia, we must recognise in the latter, the Van Sea."(2) These contradictory hypotheses are by no means proper to save Herr Geiger's theory, for not merely are they totally unnecessary, but they cannot be established, and they even land us in difficulties which force us to reject them. Chaêchaçta must be a more important sea since it receives often enough in the Avesta the epithet "deep and broad flowing,"(3)—besides as it lies in the neighbourhood of Huçrava, it cannot be remote from a great sea,—the Voura-Kasha. Amongst all the seas which hitherto it has been sought to identify with the Chaêchaçta, one only, and that the Urumia sea, exhibits both these characteristics. The Dengiz is not to be thought of, for it is by far too unimportant: this objection cannot be urged against the Issyk-kul, as it is even longer and broader than the Urumia sea,(4)

1. p. 337. 2. 337. Anm. 1.

3. Compare Yt. V. 49; IX. 18; XVII. 38.

4. The Issyk-kul has a length of from 180 to 190 Russian versts, and a breadth of 50 versts, whilst the length of the Urumia sea is about 118 versts, and its breadth about 37.

but it is much too remote from a great sea, whilst the Chaêchaçta cannot be situated far from a great sea, since the Huçrava in whose neighbourhood it is, is an outflow of the great Vouru-Kasha.(1) To this may be added the testimony of the Bundehesh, Chap. XXII. 1, according to which the Chaêchaçta is situated in Atropatene, which is confirmed by a Gloss of Neriosengh to Yaçna XXII. 26. If we further add that on the Northern shore of the Urumia sea there is a place still called Tesuic, which name is undoubtedly connected with Chaêchaçta,(2) and that Hamdallâch Mustaufi calls the Urumia sea Chechest, we cannot but admit the Urumia sea, and no other, to be identical with the Chaêchaçta. I think I may affirm that this determination of the position of the Chaêchaçta is as much beyond doubt as the identification of Mouru and Merv.

Herr Geiger, however, finally defends his view—or one of his views—in the following manner: "Will not this *one* name (i. e. Chaêchaçta) by the weight of the others be, so to say, included? Does not the perfect or complete picture which the geographical notices of the Avesta give us respecting the abode of the old Iranian people, constrain us to fix Tschaitschasta also in this quarter" ?(3) But to this argument, if it is seriously meant for an argument, I can give no serious reply. I willingly admit my inability to comprehend how the position of the Chaêchaçta sea, or the position of any other place mentioned in the Avesta, can be considered as dependent on the degree of finish of an imperfect and not quite faithful

1. Compare Yt. V. 49; IX. 18; XVII. 38.

2. Compare Windischmann, *Zor. Stud.* 13 ; *Ritter Erdkunde.* 911, 1014.

3. p. 338.

picture: I believe rather that they must be determined on the basis of undoubted facts and authentic statements, as I believe I have just determined them.

If Chaêchaçta is the Urumia sea, then Huçrava must unquestionably be the Van sea; Herr Geiger admits this,(1) so that it would be quite superfluous further to develop the grounds for this assertion. In Siroz. I, 9; II, 9, and Nyâish V. 5, Huçrava is mentioned near the mountain Açnavañt and the sea of Chaêchaçta, without its position being more closely defined. According to Yt. XIX. 56 it is an outflow of the sea Vouru-Kasha, and its origin is explained by the fact that the Iranian Majesty or Splendour which the Turanian Franraçyan sought to usurp, fled from the Vouru-Kasha and formed the Hucrava. According to the Avesta the sea of Huçrava is thus situated not far from the Vouru-Kasha, and the Chaêchaçta sea, and I need not point out that the Bundehesh confirms this position and fixes it more precisely.(2) We have, therefore, two seas which, according to the statements of the Avesta, are situated in the extreme West, and which can be identified with the Urumia sea and the Van sea. Thus the comprehensive thesis which Herr Geiger considers that he has established is deficient in proof,—a thesis according to which the Avestic names of places "lie without exception within the limits of the list of countries given." (3) By determining the position of these seas, which as we have seen, were considered by the Avesta as lying in the West, we have gained a secure basis, which possibly will be of good service to us in fixing the position of the names of other localities.

---

1. p. 337 Anm. 1 2. Chap. XXII, 3. Chap. XII, XVII.

In the first instance, the position of Açnavañt will be evident. The name of this mountain occurs in Yt. XIX. 5 without any determination of its position, and in Siroz. I. 9; II. 9; Ny. V. 5, near Huçrava, Chaêchaçta, the unattainable Majesty, and Kava Huçrava as objects of veneration, together with people and places which act a part in the attempt of Franraçya, mentioned in Yt. XIX. 56-64, to acquire the unattainable Majesty. From the fact that the mountain Açnavañt is mentioned near the seas of Chaêchaçta and Huçrava, it appears plainly that it was not considered as lying far from them. This conjecture is strengthened by the statement of the Bundehesh,(1) according to which Açnavañt is situated in Atropatene and in the neighbourhood of Chaêchaçta. A still further confirmation of this account is given in a gloss by Neriosengh to Yasna XXIII. 26, which likewise locates Açnavañt in Atropatene.

As is well known the Bundehesh relates that Kai-Khosrav erected a temple on Mount Açnavañt for the Gushaçp fire by the aid of which he had destroyed the idolatrous temples in Chaêchaçta, and caused the fire to be brought thither. If the statement of Firdusi, is to be taken as correct Açnavañt must be identified with the mountain Savelân or Sabelân situated in the neighbourhood of the city of Ardebîl, for Firdusi states that Bahmanburg which was taken by storm by Kai-Khosrav, and was properly an idolatrous temple, as Spiegel has correctly remarked, was in the vicinity of Ardebîl. On the strength of this account Spiegel considers Savelân to be identical with Açnavañt. I cannot, however, feel convinced of the correctness of this acceptation, and firstly because it is

1. Chap. XII. XVII.

supported exclusively on the testimony of Firdusi, and his version of this relation is not original. Besides, so far as I am aware, there is no account anywhere of a Gushaçp fire-temple in Ardebîl.

Consequently I see no reason for believing that Sabelân was identical with Açnavañt. I would rather be inclined to identify Açnavañt with the Takht-i-Solaimân which is situated in the neighbourhood of the city of Candaca or Shiz—the so-called northern Ecbatana. This city possessed a famous fire-temple which was visited (1) by Bahram Gôr previous to his journey into Armenia, and to which on his return, he presented a number of rubies and other jewels.(2) Spiegel calls this temple Adarakhsh (آذرخش) and protests against confounding it with Adar Gushaçp which, in his opinion, was in the neighbourhood of Ardebîl.(3) But it will be difficult to produce the proof that the Gushaçp fire-temple was anywhere else than in Candaca (the Armenian Gandzak). Not to mention other accounts I refer to the Armenian historian, Sebeos, who in a passage of his history speaks of the great fire-temple of the city of Gandzak, and calls it Vshnaçp. That Vshnaçp, notwithstanding its *m* is essentially identical with Gushaçp, and that here also there is question of the temple of Adar Gushaçp, is self-evident. The Armenian form Vshnaçp corresponds precisely to the Persian Gushnaçp, and this word actually occurs in proper names, as in Meh-Adar Gushnaçp, Namdar Gushnaçp, &c. (4) But that it was one of the various fire Gushnaçp given by the

1. Compare *Tabarî*, translated by Nöldeke, p. 100. Anm. 1.

2. *Tabarî* translated by Nöld. p. 104. 3. *Eran Alt.* I. 133.

4. Compare *Tabarî*, Nöldeke's translation, p. 387.

celebrated Adar Gushnaçp, whose temple was in Candaca, nobody will certainly maintain.

I think I may venture to assert that according to the necessarily meagre statements of the Avesta, Açnavañt lies in proximity to Chaêchaçta, that is to say, in the extreme West; and, if further, we avail ourselves of the testimony of tradition it appears in the highest degree probable that the hill Takht-i-Solaimân, is identical with Açnavañt. In any case there is but one opinion amongst specialists, viz, that Açnavañt must be sought in the extreme West.

Vouru-Kasha.

Herr Geiger expresses himself rather diffidently with respect to the Vouru-Kasha. "Rañghâ, Ardvisûra, and Vouru-Kasha are regarded by my opponents mostly for mythical localities; no one, so far as I know, locates them with any certainty in Western Iran. Thus they do not enter into the course of the argument." (1) He has, however, in his *Ostir. Kultur*—as he here also admits in a note—defended the view that the Vouru-Kasha is the sea of Aral or the Caspian sea; and this is also the opinion of other scholars. (2) But if Herr Geiger's opponents, really considered the Vouru-Kasha to be mythical, its position would not thereby be in the least degree altered, and Herr Geiger will hardly question that its mythical character does not absolutely hinder it from having passed for a definite locality. He himself says in his *Ostir. Kultur*: "Accordingly, the mythical application of the name Vouru-Kasha by no means forbids us to regard it as the original de-

1. p. 325.

2. Compare, amongst others, de Harlez, *Traduction, 2nd ed.*, p. 427, Note 1.

signation of a definite locality,—of a great sea, situated, at least at an earlier time, within the horizon of the old Iranian people."(1)

The Avesta furnishes us with no direct statements respecting the position of the Vouru-Kasha. In Yaçna XLII. 4, it is mentioned as a sea in the midst of which the pure ass is found; according to Yaçna LXV. 3, and Yasht V. 3, the Ardvi-Çûra discharges itself into the Vouru-Kasha; in the Vendidad V. 19, it is designated as the sea whither the purified water flows from the Pûitica sea, and in the midst of which grows the tree Huâpa; it is referred to as an object of veneration in Yaçna XLII. 4; Visp. VII, 4; Vendi. XIX. 35. In Vend. XXI, 4 it is described as a collection of waters; in Vend. V. 23 as superior to all other waters; according to Yt. V. 116 Arjat-Aspa sacrificed to Ardvi-Çûra in the neighbourhood of Vouru-Kasha; Yt. VIII. 6 describes the Tishtrya as going rapidly to the Vouru-Kasha; in Yt. VIII. 8 it is mentioned *à propos* of the contests of the Tishtrya with the Pairikas, and in Yt. XII. 16 it is spoken of as being guarded or defended by Rashnu: according to Yt. XII. 16 the Fravashis distributed the waters of the Vouru-Kasha amongst their families and clans; according to Yt. XII. 17 the tree Caena grows in its midst; and, lastly, it occurs six times (Yt. XIX. 51-61) in the account of the unsuccessful attempts made to acquire the "unattainable Majesty;" it should be remarked that in Yt. XIX. 56 the Huçrava, 59 the Vanhazdao and 61 the Awzdânava are described as outflows of the Vouru-Kasha.

Hitherto it has been generally admitted without, of course, regard to the statements of the Avesta, that by the Vouru-

1. *Ostir. Kult.* 52.

Kasha, the Caspian sea or the sea of Aral was understood in the Avesta. It would, I think, be easy to decide for one of these seas. So far as I know, nothing argues in favour of the Vouru-Kasha being the sea of Aral, at least no proof has been adduced in support of this view, whilst many facts may be brought to bear against it. The Avesta people had, no doubt, a knowledge of the Caspian sea, but that they were acquainted with the sea of Aral cannot be proved. The sea of Aral even if we admit that its former area was not less than what it is at present, appears relatively too unimportant to have passed for the Vouru-Kasha, for from the passages of the Avesta referring to the Vouru-Kasha we see that a very extensive body of water was understood. It may further be added that it has by no means been hitherto determined whether the sea of Aral had in ancient times generally an independent existence. We are in any case justified in admitting that the Oxus then emptied itself into the Caspian sea, and may draw the conclusion that if the sea of Aral existed at that period it was too unimportant to have played the part which is ascribed in the Avesta to the Vouru-Kasha.

The Avesta furnishes us, it is true, with few, but nevertheless important, materials for the identification of the Vouru-Kasha. For when the Huçrava was esteemed an outflow of the Vouru-Kasha (1) it must naturally have been situated nearer to it than to any other great sea. But Huçrava is, as we have seen, the Van sea, and consequently, the Vouru-Kasha must be the Caspian sea. This conclusion is confirmed by the position, already determined, of the mountain Açnavañt and the sea of Chaêchaçta, and the relation of the latter to the Vouru-Kasha.

1. Yt. XIX, 56.

Herr Geiger seeks this chain of mountains in the East because the Avesta itself does so." (1) Not the Avesta, however, but the author of a very small portion of that work looks for the Hara in the East. For our Avesta consists of several fragments, which were written at various times, in various places, and by various authors, and thus a single passage cannot possibly be taken as the rule for the whole collection, and a country which for one bard was situated in the East, may for another have been in the West. On this subject Herr Geiger expresses his view in a rather precise formula: "When it is said of Mithra" he tells us "that it comes up before the sun, over Hara-berezaiti, when this is also stated of the moon, and of the stars, it lies, without doubt, for the author of *such passages*(2) in the East."(3)

The passage to which Herr Geiger here alludes,—and which, so far as I am aware, stands quite alone in the Avesta—is Yt. X. 13. According to this passage the author must naturally have been to the west of the Hara but thereby we have only the relative position of the place; respecting the district where the bard writes, which must have been situated to the west of the Hara we are left to conjectures. To be able to admit that the range of mountains which surround the southern shore of the Caspian Sea cannot be identical with the Hara, we must be furnished with proof that the author of the above-mentioned passage resided to the east of the modern Alburz; we shall then be entitled to doubt

1. *Vaterl. und Zeit. d. Avesta.* 330.
2. The italics are mine,
3. *Vaterl. u. Zeit. d. Avesta,* p. 330-331.

the identity of the Alburz mountains lying to the south of the Caspian Sea with the Hara-berezaiti. Previously, no conclusion can be drawn from this statement for the position of the Hara.

It will not be denied that the name Alburz given to the range of mountains which border the southern shore of the Caspian sea, is quite identical with the Avestic Hara. Herr Geiger himself admits this expressly several times.(1) This identity of the names would then under ordinary circumstances suffice to render the identity of the mountains most probable. But the Elbrus in the Caucasus also receives the name of Albarzond. Consequently two mountain ranges, none of which lies easterly in respect to Mouru, Bâkhdhi, &c, can claim to be regarded as the Hara-berezaiti, in so far as this name is to be looked on, as indicating an actual range of mountains, and it only remains to consider the arguments which speak in favour of one or the other. The case appears somewhat different to Herr Geiger. "We thus have found" he says "the name Hara-berezaiti undoubtedly employed for two different mountain chains. We must then admit the *possibility* that it was even applied to a third. But in this (in what ?) we may recognise with *certainty* the great Central Asian Alpine land of Pamir, of Thianschar and Alai which to the Iranians *could well appear* as bounding their world in the East."(2)

It is, however, quite as possible that the name Hara-berezaiti was applied to a fourth or even to a fifth range of mountains. But does this possibility prove anything for the position of the Avestic Hara ? Certainly not. Of a third Alburz situated in the East from Mouru we have absolutely no information, and accordingly we are not justified in

1. *Ostir. Kultur*, 43., *Vat. u. d. Av.* 331. 2. *Ibid.* 331.

concluding the actual existence of such from a mere possibility—which is not at all probable. Such arbitrary procedure can only prejudice the cause of true learning. Hara-berezaiti may certainly, as Herr Geiger pretends, be a passing name, but only because in the form Alburz it points out two different mountain ranges; if this were not the case we should have no right to consider it as such. But if the expression "passing name" is to signify that the designation Hara-berezaiti was employed for more than two chains of mountains, we have no reason to regard it is a "passing name" in this acceptation.

I think, now, it may be asserted that the Elbrûs range on the south of the Caspian sea is the Avestic Hara-berezaiti. According to Yt. XV. 7–9 Haoshyaŋhah sacrificed to the god of the wind Vayu on Taera, a peak of Hara, that this deity might enable him to overcome the Mazanian and Varenian demons. According to Yt. V. 21, the same Haoshyaŋha offers a sacrifice to Ardvi-Çûra at the foot of the Hara in order to obtain strength to annihilate the Mazanian demons,—according to Yt. IX. 3. 4 he also sacrificed to Druâçpa, and according to Yt. XVII. 24, 25 to Ashi-Vaŋuhi for the same object.

But the enemies of Haoshyaŋha whose destruction he had so much at heart, resided in the country of Mâzenderân and Gelân. On this point all interpreters—Herr Geiger included—are I believe of the same opinion. (1) Consequently the mountain at the foot of which he offered so many sacrifices, must also be situated in the neighbourhood of this country, conformably to which the Alburz lie to the south of the Caspian sea.

1. Compare Geiger. *Ostir Kultur.* 44; Spiegel. *Erân Alt.* I. 66, II. 130, 131; Justi, *Handb. S. V. Mâzainga*; de Harlez, *Trad.* I. 111, note 5.

The only description of the Hara which occurs in the Avesta is found in Yt. X. 50-53; it is also repeated in Yt. XII. 23. In my opinion this description refers to a mythical mountain only; it is certainly not applicable to an Iranian mountain or a mountain range bordering on Iran, and, least of all to the Alpine land of Pamir. According to the description neither night nor darkness exists there, neither hot nor icy wind. But the Alpine land of Pamir is reckoned amongst the coldest countries of the world. It is covered with snow during six months of the year, the rivers are frozen in winter, and even in summer, according to the assurance of Hioven Thsang, snow-storms are not a rare phenomenon.(1) Thus the only description which the Avesta contains of the Hara, applies to no real mountain range with which the old Iranians were acquainted.

Our texts, moreover, contain no statements which would be proper to throw any light on the position of the Hara. In Yt. X. 118 the Hara is, it is true, mentioned as a mountain over which the sun rises; in Vend. XXI. 5 the name occurs in a similar connection, and in Vend. XIX. 30, the embodied actions of the just in the form of a young maiden assist their souls to Heaven over the Hara. But passages of this kind afford us no assistance. Thus the strongest ground for the opinion according to which the Hara-berezaiti lay to the south of the Caspian sea is found in the identity of the names Alburz and Hara-berezaiti, and in the circumstance that the Avestic Hara must have been situated in the neighbourhood of Gelân and Mâzandarân. There is not the slightest ground for holding that the Hara was one of the mountain ranges in Eastern Iran.

1. Compare J. Van den Gheyn, *le Plateau de Pamir*, p. 8. (Bruxelles 1883).

As the Taera is considered the summit of the Hara its position is, of course, evident. The passages in which the Taera is mentioned communicate to us nothing new(1),—according to one passage at least (Yt. XV. 7) the Taera was regarded as a real mountain. Nor do we learn anything new from the Avesta respecting Hukairya which was also a peak of the Hara. Haoma sacrificed there to Mithra;(2) thence flowed the Ardvi-çûra(3) and continued its course to the Vouru-Kasha;(4) and Yima sacrificed to various deities(5) on Taera which was defended by Rashnu.(6)

Airyana-Vaeja, Daitya and Dareja.

I have found it difficult to understand and duly to estimate the line of argument which Herr Geiger employs against the identity of Airyana-Vaêja with Arrân. I refer naturally to Arrân which is confined between the Kur and the Araxes. Firstly, if Airyana-Vaêja is to be considered a *semi*-mythical country, we must consequently beware of drawing any comprehensive conclusion therefrom. Secondly, is it to be regarded as lying outside the precise limits of the Iranian people ?(7) But this cannot serve for the confirmation of the East Iranian theory, for we can "with the greatest probability conclude that Airyana-Vaedscha was situated yet higher in the North than Sughdha. It may accordingly in general be right, *if we seek it somewhere in upper Ferghanah.*"(8)

In the speech of an advocate defending an accused person such questionable arguments may be permitted, but when we

1. Yt. XIX. 6; Yaçna XLII. 3; Yt. XV. 7. 2. Yt. X, 88.
3. Yt. V. 96. 4. Yaçna LXV, 3; Yt. V. 3; XIII, 6.
5. Yt. XV. 15; XVII. 28; V. 25; IX. 8. 6. Yt. XII, 24.
7. *Vaterl. u. Zeit. d. Avesta* 331-332.
8. Geiger himself has rightly italicised these words p. 333.

have in view the interests of learning they are less in place. If Airyana-Vaêja is a mythical country because Ahura-Mazda had his abode there, the Hara-berezaiti must likewise be mythical since on its summit Ahura-Mazda erected a habitation for Mithra. Ushidao must also be regarded as mythical because it had become even an object of worship, &c. On the other hand, if Airyana-Vaêja really lies outside the boundaries of the Avesta people, Herr Geiger should have omitted it form consideration, for at page 322 he says: "Bawri cannot be adduced as an argument. When we inquire concerning the Home of the Avesta there can only be question of countries which were considered as Iranian." But to be logical is not, perhaps, a matter of primary concern with Herr Geiger.

I cannot agree with him on this point. His opinion cannot be proved, and will not pass for a tenable hypothesis. No doubt the Avesta, which Herr Geiger considers the only authentic authority, gives us no direct information with reference to the position of Airyana-Vaêja; but this country is too often mentioned in that work, and plays too important a part to be regarded as non-Iranian. Zarathushtra himself lived and laboured there. From the Avesta we learn that Ahura-Mazda created the land of Airyana-Vaêja,(1) that he collected the Yazatas there, and that Yima was there present at an assembly of the best men.(2) Zarathushtra actively exerted himself there (3); he sacrificed there to Druaçpa(4); to Ashi-Vanuhi (5) and to Ardvi-Çûra (6); even Ahura-Mazda himself offered sacrifice to Ardvi-Çûra and to Vâyu (8) in Airyana-Vaêja, and finally, the land itself was regarded as an

1. Vend. I. 1, 3. 2. Vend. II. 21. 3. Yaçna IX. 14. 4. Yt. IX. 25. 5. Yt. XVII. 45. 6. Yt. V. 104. 7. Yt. V. 17. 8. Yt. XV. 2.

object of worship.(1) The Bundehesh informs us, amongst other things, that Zarathushtra established the first religious worship in Airyana-Vaêja(2) and that this country lies alongside Atropatene.(3) There can thus be no doubt that Zarathushtra was considered in close relation with Airyana-Vaêja and that this country was esteemed the Home of the Zarathushtrian religion. Everything then points to Western Iran as the Home of Zoroastrianism; but this view is more especially supported by the character of the new doctrine and the circumstance that it sprang partly from the non-Iranian West.

We see, moreover, on the one side that Zarathushtra established the first religious worship in Airyana-Vaêja, and besides was extremely active there, but, on the other hand, the Avesta calls Ragha in Media "Zarathushtrian," and points it out as the seat of the successors of the reformers—which statement is historically confirmed: thus the conclusion appears to be that Airyana-Vaêja lies in the West. This is further confirmed by the statement of the Bundehesh, according to which Airyana-Vaêja must have been situated to the side of Atropatene. All this appears very simple and very logical, but Herr Geiger does not argue in this manner—he deduces something quite different from the passages quoted above.

He considers that the statement of the Bundehesh is annulled by the testimony of the Avesta, according to which Airyana-Vaêja lies in the north. This assertion appears rather strange, and it is so in reality, for the Avesta gives us no direct information as to the position of Airyana-Vaêja. Herr Geiger, however, appeals to the order or succession of the names in the list of countries found in the first Fargarad of the

1. Yt. I, 21. 2. Bund. XXXIII, 3. 3. Bund. XXIX, 12.

Vendidad which cannot be accidental. But he has omitted to prove this assertion, and if it cannot be proved we must accept it on faith. According to what principle is this order or succession arranged? Herr Geiger considers that it begins in the extreme north and proceeds constantly to the south-(1) If this principle were actually followed it *might* have been simply accidental; but in reality it has not been carried out.

I will admit beforehand that Herr Geiger has correctly identified all the names occurring in the list of countries, for without this admission the principle does not hold at all. The eight first names are thus in their places, *if their position has been correctly fixed*; but after the mention of Urva in the East, Khneñta in Hyrcania is named—a not quite justifiable return to the north-west. From Khneñta we are then led to Harahvati in the south-east. Haêtumat is named as the eleventh country, and then again the author abruptly returns to the north-west and names Ragha. Then follow Chakhra and Varena, and finally a south-eastern bound is made to the country of the Seven Rivers. Admitting that Herr Geiger has quite correctly determined all the names of places, we thus see in the most favourable case that this very famous order or succession follows no fixed principle. And nevertheless he believes that great weight is to be attached to this nominal order, and important conclusions are to be drawn therefrom respecting the Avestic geography. But if we hesitate to admit the identification of the names proposed by Herr Geiger, what remains of the order or succession which is in question? And we must not forget that Herr Geiger, in order to establish the probability of a certain principle in the arrangement of the names

1. *Ostir. Kult.* p. 5.

in the list so frequently referred to, assumes, and this without any grounds, that Airyana-Vaêja is in the north and Urva in the east (1), and then to prove that Airyana-Vaêja is in the north and Urva in the east relies on the principle of the arrangement which obtains in the list. (2) Since the enumeration proceeds from north to south (3) (notwithstanding the fact that it also goes in a inverse order,) and since Çugdha, Mouru, Bâkhdhi, Niçaya and Haraeva follow Airyana-Vaêja this must be more northerly than the others, and consequently be identical with Ferghanah.

Nothing, of course, is proved by argumentation conducted in this fashion. It is only after it has been proved that Airyana-Vaêja is more northerly than Çugdha, Mouru and Bâkhdhi, we can assert of the enumeration that it proceeds from north to south. It may further be added that some important variations occur in the order followed, so that it is even from the outset possible that in this case—where there is question of Airyana-Vaêja we have to deal with one such deviation. We have moreover, already seen that according to the indirect statements of the Avesta it is very probable that Airyana-Vaêja is identical with the modern Arrân. This conjecture becomes almost a certainty when we consult tradition, as the Bundehesh very plainly seeks Airyana-Vaêja to the side of Atropatene, which almost corresponds with the position of the modern Arrân. But not the Bundehesh only, but likewise the commentator of the passage Vend. I. 16, appears to

1. p. 325. 2. 333. 3. This idea is by no means new. Spiegel has with much caution, and in a somewhat anomalous form, already expressed it (*Erân Alt.* I. 125); he has, however, avoided drawing such comprehensive conclusions from it.

have considered Airyana-Vaêja as situated in the neighbourhood of Atropatene, since he explains Ragha by Atropatene.(1) We have then on the one hand, the fact, that Airyana-Vaêja was for a long time the scene of Zarathushtra's activity,—according to Yaçna IX. 4, he is the hero of Airyana-Vaêja,—and, on the other, tradition informs us that the Zarathushtrian religion had its rise in the West.

According to tradition it appears that Airyana-Vaêja lay in the West, and as there is actually a country *Ariania* between the Kur and the Araxes it may obviously be identified with the Avestic Airyaṇa-Vaêja. This result would be but confirmed if I wished to test it after a method much esteemed by Herr Geiger,—that is, by a comparison with the views expressed by other specialists.(2) If then the Avesta, tradition, and the unanimity of specialists declare against Herr Geiger's conjecture, it stands but little chance of becoming the general opinion.

The position of the rivers Dâitya and Dareja is ascertained from that of Airyana-Vaêja. In the Avesta the Dâitya appears as an object of worship;(3) also as a river on whose

1. Compare Spiegel *Eran Alt.* I. 683.

2. Compare Windischmann *Zor. Stud.* p. 47; Justi, *Bundehesh* p. 81 *Beitr. Z. alt. Geogr. Pers.* p. 18: Lagarde *Gesamm. Abh.* p. 158, where (Heb.) *Mogug* (Genes. X, 2) with magu vaêjaŋh, in the sense of Airyana-Vaêja are placed together, and explained to be the mountainous country between Cappadocia and Media; Spiegel (*Eran das Land zw. d. Indus und Tigris* p. 59; *Eran Alt.* I. 212) recognises Airyana-Vaêja in the modern Arrân; de Harlez. *Trad.* I p. 7 note 2, decides for no fixed view.

3. Yt. I. 21; Vend. XIX. 2; (in this passage de Harlez translates vaŋhuyâo dâityayâo by "de la creation parfaite."

banks Zairi-Vairi sacrificed to Ardvi-Çûra(1) and Kava Vistaçpa to Druâçpa.(2) But beyond the fact that the Dâitya is a river of Airyana-Vaêja,(3) which receives confirmation from a remark of the Bundehesh(4), the statements of the Avesta throw no light on the position of these rivers. The latter are supplemented by the notice of the Bundehesh, according to which the Dâitya comes from Airyana-Vaêja and flows through Gurjestân (Georgia). This account which identifies the Dâitya with the Araxes,(5) agrees strictly with the results previously attained, and contradicts unequivocally the theory defended by Herr Geiger. This scholar, nevertheless, believes that the reading Gurjestân must be rejected as it is not attested in writing but is merely a conjecture of Justi. If it were actually a mere conjecture, but a probable one, I do not see that on that account, without further proof, it must be regarded as incorrect. Least of all do I understand why Herr Geiger rejects it, since he himself in the course of his learned Essay, has pointed out as already accepted many forced and improbable conjectures. It is not however, a conjecture which deviates from the original reading; Justi has merely, instead of a false punctuation restored the correct one, without altering anything in the text, and it seems to me that the amended reading is as ingenious as it is correct, without regard to the question which is here under consideration.

---

1. Yt. V. 112. 2. Yt. IX. 29. 3. Yt. V. 17. 104. (de Harlez does not regard it here as a proper name but translates it as in Vend. XIX. 2.) Yt. XV. 2. (in de Harlez "de nature parfaite"); Vend. I, 3 de Harlez has, "d' excellente nature.) Vend. II, 21, (de Harlez translates it as in Vend. XIX. 2.; compare *Traduction* I p. 19 note 1). 4. Chap. XX. 5. Spiegel thinks, nevertheless, that the Dâitya can be identified with the Kur. *Eran Alt.* I, 200.

Respecting the position of the river Dareja on whose bank stands the house of Zarathushtra's father the Avesta gives us no explanation, but as the Dareja as well as the Dâitya was considered to be in Airyana-Vaêja (1) it must naturally be sought also in the West.

USHIDAO, KÃÇOYA, USHIDARENA.

Herr Geiger contents himself with stating the fact that the Ushidâo is generally considered as East Iranian without determining its position more precisely.(2) In his *Ostir. Kultur* he hazards the conjecture that the Ushidâo may be situated in the neighbourhood of Kãçoya *i. e.* the sea of Hamun, and identical with the Nihbandan which rises over its western shore.(3) I believe, however, that it is situated much more to the north-east, and this view must be regarded as the only correct one if I have rightly apprehended the passages which refer to it. The Ushidâo, with the Ushidarena, is once mentioned as an object of worship(4) and moreover, it is mentioned in the list of mountains,(3) but the principal passage is Yt. XIX. 66, which is not very easily explained, as any one may satisfy himself who goes to the trouble of comparing the translations of the three last interpreters. I read the passage thus :

Yat upanhachat
Yo avadhât fravakhshyêiti(5)
Yatha zrayo yat kacayem(6)
Yatha gairis yo Ushidâo
Yim aiwitô paôiris âpô

1. Bund. XX. 2. *Vaterl. u. Zeit. d. Av.* 325.

3. p. 130. 4. Yt. I. 31, de Harlez does not here treat it as a proper name; he translates it "Nous honorons la montagne Ushidarena qui donne l'intelligence." *Trad.* II. p. 405. 5. Yt. XIX. 2. 4. Nach. D. 6. Herr Geiger (*Ostir. Kult.* 108 Anm. 4) reads *Yatha Zrayo yat Kasum haetumatem* and translates *haetumatem* by "belonging to Haetumat."

so that I erase *haêtumañtem* and refer *yim* in the fourth line to *gairis* as de Harlez has done.(1) That there is here question of Haetumat I have not the slightest doubt, although this word, if we here strike it out, occurs for the first time in § 67 according to Geldner's conjecture.(2) As is known the Haetumañt of the Avesta is the Etymander of the later Greek and Roman writers. But as the latter takes its rise in the Koh-i-Baba, the Ushidâo must also be there. Since on the one hand the Haetumañt, according to the above quoted passage flows to the sea of Kãçoya, and on the other the Hilmend or Etymander empties itself into the sea of Hâmûn, we are justified in identifying the sea of Kãçoya with the sea of Hâmûn. Spiegel, it is true, considers the Abistâde to be the Kãçoya but admits there are many grounds for Justi's view, according to which the Kãçoya was identical with the Hâmûn. (3) The Bundehesh, of course, at first sight appears to support Spiegel's opinion, since it describes the Kãçoya as a salt sea which justly applies to the Abistâde, but not to the sea of Hâmûn. However if we take into account the circumstance that even the Bundehesh was acquainted with an older tradition according to which the Kãçoya had sweet water, it will be easily understood that we have in this case to do with a mistake or an error.(4)

---

1. I would not, however, translate it precisely as de Harlez has done. I would render it somewhat thus : (the Majesty) which accords with it (Haêtumant river) which flows thither where the Kãçoya sea is found, from the mountain Ushidâo near which, &c.

2. Compare *Drei Yasht aus d. Zendâvesta* p. 131. 3. *Eran Alt.* I. 199

4. From the passages of the Avesta Yt. XIX. 92 and Vend. XIX. 5. we learn nothing of the position of Kaçoya.

The position of the Ushidarena is determined only approximately, for the Avesta although it mentions this mountain with sufficient frequency, gives us no direct assistance to ascertain its situation. In the list of mountains we naturally meet the Ushidarena, but without any more precise definition of its locality;(1) in most cases it receives the epithets *mazda-dhâta* and *asha-qathra*,(2) but sometimes it appears without them.(3)

The Avesta nowhere appears to treat the Ushidarena as an actual mountain. The Bundehesh on the contrary, declares it to be in Segestan; however, I think with Justi,(4) Windischmann,(5) and de Harlez(6) that we have here only an attempt of later interpreters to fix a definite locality for a purely mythical mountain. Herr Geiger does not venture to determine more precisely the position of this mountain—he only asserts of Ushidarena, as also of seven other places, that they may "perhaps generally—even by opponents—be admitted as East Iranian."(7) But this assertion, so for as it refers to Ushidarena, is as I have already explained, without foundation.

URVA.

Urva is mentioned only once in the Avesta, and that in the list of countries.(8) It receives the epithet "pasture-rich" (*pouruvâçtra*,) but its position is not fixed. De Harlez considers Urva to be a city lying in the south of Khorâsân; on what he basis this conjecture, I know not,—the epithet "pasture-

1. Yt. XIX. 2. 2. Yaçna I. 14; II. 14; III. 16; IV. 19; XXII. 16; XXV. 7; XIX. 0, 97; Siroz I. 26, 28. 3. Yt. I. 31. 4. *Handb. d. Zendspr. s. v. Ushidarena.* 5. *Zor. Stud.* 7. 6. *Trad.* t. II. p. 258, note 4 and p. 54 Note 1. 7. *Vaterl. u. Zeit. d. Avesta* p. 325. 8. Vend. I. 11.

51165

rich" applies more to a country than to a city. Justi inquires doubtingly, whether it is not to be sought in Media. Since the Avesta furnishes us with no materials to ascertain its position we must omit Urva from our consideration.

KANHA, VAEÇKA, KHSHATHRO-ÇAOKA.

Kaṅha, Vaêçka and Khshathrô-çaoka canstitute a group, and the position of one determines that of the others. In Yt. V. 54. Tuça offers a sacrifice to the goddess Ardvi-çûra and implores her for strength to overcome the Hunus in Vaêçka, at the narrow pass Khshathrô-çaoka in Khaṅha. In Yt. V. 57 the Hunus, on the other hand, beseech the same goddess for victory over Tuça. On the strength of these necessarily insufficient data Herr Geiger considers that Kaṅha must be situated in the East. The Avesta, he thinks locates Kaṅha towards Tûrân and as Tûrân is the country which lies north of the Oxus. Kaṅha must also be there. With these results the statements of the later Parsi books should agree. The accounts of the Parsi writings are, however, so contradictory that it is extremely difficult to get a clear idea of what the authors themselves thought of the position of Kaṅha. According to the Bundehesh it is on the eastern coast of the Vouru-Kasha (1); according to the Mainyo-i-Khard it is on the east near the star Çatvêça but still situated within the limits of Iranvej. But Iranvej lies in the West, and Catvêça is also the star of the West. With reference to the statements of Firdusi we must admit, unless we wish to accuse him of a contradiction, that he has described two different Kangdiz, of which one was situated in the east of China, and the other is, perhaps, identical with the present Tashkent. It is not, however, an easy matter to prove that

1. Chap. XXX.

either the one or the other is the Avestic Kaṅha. The admission of two different countries of this name explains perhaps sufficiently the contradictory statements which the author of the above quoted passage has made; at the same time, however, the difficulty of determining the position of the Avestic Kaṅha is much enhanced. (1)

As regards the passages quoted above from the Avesta, it cannot, without further proof, be inferred from them that Kaṅha is situated in the East, as, in the opinion of some scholars, they appear to support equally well the view that it lies in the West. (2) In the Avesta Qyaona or Hyaona and Varedhaka appear as Vistaçpa's habitual enemies. They resided, as is well known, on the west side of the Caspian sea. But Kaṅha is mentioned in the Avesta as the abode of Vistaçpa the adversary of the Hunus, so that Kaṅha to all appearences is situated on the western shore of the Caspian sea. Herr Geiger remarks on the contrary: "So far as we are able to trace back Kaṅha in the local sources, it is to be sought in the East." This, however, can only refer to the accounts of the later Parsi writings, and what value we are to attach to these statements appears from what has been said above. That the Varedakha of the Avesta are identical with the *Vartae* is most probable, though of course it cannot be mathematically proved. The same may be asserted of the Hyaona and the *Chioniten*.(3 Herr Geldner has indeed not long since proposed a new inter-

1. Compare Justi's *Bund.* p. 208—209; Windischmann, *Zor. Stud.* 16, et seq. 2. Compare Spiegel *Sybels. hist. Zeitschr. neue F. B.* 8 p. 20.

3. Compare Ammianus Marcellinus XIX, 2, 3: Pars quœ orientem spectabat, *Chionitis* evenit, qua funestus nobis ceciderat, adulescens. *Vertae* meridiano lateri sunt destinati: tractum servabant septentrionis Albani.

pretation of the word Hyaona according to which it was not a *nomen proprium*, but signified wanderers or gipsies. I believe it is quite possible that the word signifies gipsies without on that account its ceasing to be a *nomen proprium*.

Herr Geiger's objections are not yet entirely exhausted; he thinks that it cannot be satisfactorily established that the Chioniten dwelt on the west shore of the Caspian sea, till we have proof that by the Gelanen (1) mentioned by Ammianus are understood the inhabitants of Gêlân. But that Ammianus by this name indicated the population of Gêlân is neither a new idea nor an improbable one, only that whoever wishes to advance it as a certainty exposes himself to objections of this kind. The entire view expressed by Spiegel is only a hypothesis, but it appears a probable one. Herr Geiger regards it very likely as improbable,—at all events it is possible. This may also be asserted, but in a less degree, of Herr Geiger's view, but as long as we have no fresh data, we cannot attach value to one or the other hypothesis as an argument in support of other theories. The position of Kaṅha accordingly remains uncertain, and this evidently applies also to Vaêçka and Khshathrô-çaoka.

Frazdânava.

Herr Geiger says very little respecting the position of Frazdânava. That he should seek it in the East is quite intelligible, as the Bundehesh defines Frazdânava to be a sea in Segestân. His only argument, if indeed I can call it such, is put in the following manner:—" As to what concerns Frazdânava, in the first instance no one has hitherto thought of seeking it in Western Iran. According to the *concordant*

1. XVII. 5, 1.

statements of tradition it lies in the East. "(1) So far as I know this question has hitherto received but little attention, so that it is easily understood why no one has sought Frazdânava in Western Iran. Moreover, in matters of this kind there is no such thing as prescriptive right, and we can conclude nothing from the silence of our predecessors. It is not altogether clear to me what Herr Geiger understands by the "concordant statements of tradition." In his *Ostir. Kultur* where he hazards the conjecture that Frazadânava may be the ancient name for the sea of Hâmûn or the Denzig, he does not mention these "concordant statements." That the account of the Bundehesh is not understood by these terms I am fully convinced, for Herr Geiger attaches but little importance to this book, with reference to which he has expressed himself as follows: "*I do not attach much value* to the geographical statements of the Bundehesh, because it sets forth a system of the world of which *there is no trace in the Avesta.*"(2) It is a pity that he has not cited these "concordant statements of tradition."

We learn then very little from the Avesta on this matter—only that Vistaçpa offered a sacrifice to Ardvi-Çûra behind the water of the Frazdânava, and besought her to enable him to overcome his enemy Arjat-açpa.(3) If we bear in mind that Vistaçpa also sacrificed to Druâçpa behind the Dâitya(4) also in the West, and that as Spiegel has shown, the scene of his activity was principally in the West, it is *á priori* probable that Frazdânava was also situated in the West. A confirmation of this view is found in the identity, recognized by

1. *Vaterl. u. Zeitalt. d. Avesta* p. 326. 2. Ibid. 323.
3. Yt. V. 108. 4. Yt. IX. 29; XVII. 50.

Lagarde, of Frazdanava with the Armenian river name Hrazdân.(1) The Avestic Frazdanava may obviously be pronounced a river, and in fact the river Hrazdân, which accords so much the more with the statement of the Avesta, as the Hrazdân mentioned by Moses of Khorni (2) is a tributary river of the Araxes, that is to say, the Dâitya.

According to the Bundehesh (3) the Frazdânava was, on the one hand, a sea in Segestân, but on the other, its sources were connected with the Vouru-Kasha, all which does not seem quite clear. Herr Geiger considers that the last portion of this statement means simply that the water of the Frazdânava was salt, as that of the sea. (4) I need not however, draw attention to the arbitrariness of such an interpretation ;—I content myself with showing the novelty of this conjecture. The Bundehesh which at other times expresses itself so precisely, and several times describes the water of a sea as salt, must have employed so obscure a periphrasis to render the idea of salt, that until now only one single scholar has discovered its sense !

Herr Geiger has, however, another argument to reject the identity of both rivers ; whilst he admits the identity of the names Hrazdân and Frazdânava, he ingeniously suggests that the identity of the rivers is not thereby established, but is rendered directly improbable, because the one name is *Armenian* and the other *Irânian*. I cannot agree with him in this, because it can be proved that the authors of the Avesta were acquainted with Armenia, or at least with a considerable portion of it, and that some of the events related in the Avesta

1. Compare Lagarde, *Beitr. z. baktr. Lex.* p. 28 ; *Armen. Stud.* p. 90, 1319.
2. I. 12 ; II. 11. 3. Chap. XXII. 4. *Ostir. Kult.* p. 109.

took place there. I might, moreover, remind him, whether we regard the Armenian as an Iranian language or not, that Hrazdân has as little claim to being an original Armenian word as *pandâṇ*, *Ormazd*, *Mogpat* &c. I regard it as a periphrase of the Pehlvi Frazdân, formed according to the laws of sound which obtain in the Armenian language.

Vanhazdao and Awzdanava.

When Fraŋraçya made the attempt to usurp or get possession of the unattainable Majesty in the Vouru-Kasha, it fled from him, and then originated, first the sea of Huçrava, then the Vaŋhazdâo, and lastly, the Awzdânava. Although the Avesta gives us no more precise information with respect to the last two bodies of water, it is, nevertheless, obvious that they are to be sought in the neighbourhood of the Caspian sea, since we have identified the Huçrava, which likewise is esteemed an outflow of the Vouru-Kasha, with the Van sea. This, however, is naturally but a conjecture from which we can draw no conclusion. There is absolutely nothing to support the view that these seas were situated in the East.

The Ranha (1) and the Gudha. (2)

As the Raŋhâ, the Ardvi-Çûra and the Vouru-Kasha "pass" amongst Herr Geiger's opponents "mostly for mythical localities they do not enter into the course of the argument." He does not pursue more closely the inquiry as to the

1. Compare for example, Vend. I. 20; Yt. V. 63, 81, 82; X. 104; XII. 18, 19; XIV. 29; XV. 27; XX. 5; XXI. 2.

2. Yt. XV. 27.

Raṅhâ's position. (1) I am just as little inclined to discuss here this intricate question, since it has been already investigated from every side ; I would only assure Herr Geiger that his " opponents " have not been quite satisfied of the mythical character of the Raṅhâ ;—they have even made the attempt to fix its position.(2) Against the view according to which the Raṅhâ was the Oxus or the Jaxartes, the following not quite convincing arguments may be adduced: 1° The place which this river-name gets in the list of countriess,—upposing we are inclined to admit a principle of order or arrangement in the list. 2° The circumstance that the Pehlvi translation of the passage Vend. I. 20, lays the foundation of the view that the Raṅhâ is identical with the Tigris. 3° The identity of the Gudha which, as is known, was considered a tributary of the Raṅhâ, with the Gyndes of Herodotus (I. 189). However, no great importance can be attached to these considerations, and without deciding for the Oxus or the Jaxartes, I am disposed to seek the Raṅhâ and consequently the Gudha, rather in Eastern Iran than in Western.

The position of Vitaṅuhaiti, Maenakha, Arezura, and Erezifya, in so far as they denote actual localities, cannot be determined. Chakhra, which holds the thirteenth place in the list of countries, Herr Geiger seeks in Tabiristan; (3) in his opinion it is one of the most westerly districts of the Avesta

---

1. Compare *Ostir. Kult.* 34 et seq.

2. Compare Windischmann, *Zor. Stud.* 187—189 ; Spiegel *Eran Alt.* 281 et seq. Lagarde. *Gesamm. Abhandl.* 262, 263, *Beitr. Z baktr. Lex.* 62 ; Justi, Bund. 61 ; de Harlez, *Trad.* I. 12.

3. *Vaterl. u. Zeit. d. Avesta*, p. 324.

people.(1) Since I have no preconceived theory to support I cannot agree with Herr Geiger in this, as the reasons which he adduces–the common acceptation(2) and the position assigned to Chakhra in the list of countries,(3) appear to have no argumentative force, hence the position of Chakhra is not established. The same may be said of Iskata and Pouruta of which Herr Geiger states they appear "as a constantly united pair."(4) In Yt. X. 14 they are mentioned near Mouru, Haraêva, Gâu, Çughdha and Qâirizem. But I doubt much if this mention of them near these East Iranian countries entitles us to locate them also in Eastern Iran.

Lastly, mention may also be made of the mountain Kaoiriça,(5) which according to the Bundehesh(6) is situated in Airyana-Vaêja. Justi appears to have in view the old Persian Kundurus in Media, which cannot have been situated far from Qazvin, and calls attention to Kundar a place still existing there. However this may be, it can hardly be a matter of doubt that Kaoiriça was considered as a mountain situated in Western Iran.

If now we put together the results of this inquiry we may affirm that the Avesta was very well acquainted with Western Iran, and regarded as holy some of its localities. Of the 50 districts it has been shown that 17 are East or North Iranian, 18 belong to the West or North-West, and 15 are purely my-

1. *Ostir. Kult.* 113.
2. *Vaterl. u. Zeit d. Avesta*, 324.
3. *Ostir. Kult.* 127.
4. *Ostir. Kult.* 131. They are named together in Yt. X. 14.
5. Yt. XIX. 6.
6. Chap. XII.

thical countries or cannot be identified.(1) Herr Geiger protests against the bringing forward of two of these places situated in the West—Bawri and Kvirinta–because they are not Iranian. But they also must be taken into account as they show that the Avesta people stand in near relation with the West, which becomes intelligible only when we have pronounced Western Iran to be the Home of the Avesta. If we recollect that the position of the Raṅhâ and the Gudha which I have reckoned as East Iranian localities, have not been finally determined the proportion of East Iranian to West Iranian districts remains unchanged, even if we omit Bawri and Kvirinta. In the words of Herr Geiger I may exclaim, " It is really difficult to argue with one to whom this numerical proportion is not satisfactory. "

At the first glance it must appear very strange that Herr Geiger and I should have arrived at such opposite results,—and

1. The 50 names of places may be classified as follows:—

East.	West.	Not identified.
1 Cughdha	1 Airyana-Vaêja.	1 Vaeçka.
2 Gâu.	2 Dâitya.	2 Kaṅhâ.
3 Qâirizem.	3 Dareja.	3 Khshathrô-çaoka.
4 Raṅhâ ?	4 Hara-berezaiti.	4 Urva.
5 Gudha ?	5 Taêra.	5 Chakhra.
6 Mouru.	6 Hukairya.	6 Pouruta.
7 Bâkhdhi.	7 Vouru-Kasha.	7 Iskata.
8 Niçaya.	8 Vehrkâna.	8 Vitaṅuhaiti.
9 Haraêva.	9 Khnenta.	9 Maênakha.
10 Vâitigaêça.	10 Varena.	10 Erezifya.
11 Vaêkereta.	11 Ragha.	11 Arezura.
12 Harahvati.	12 Frazdânava.	12 Ardvi-çûra.
13 Haêtumañt.	13 Açnavañt.	13 Ushidarena.
14 Piçina.	14 Huçrava.	14 Vaṅhazdâo.
15 Haptahiṅdava.	15 Chaêchaçta.	15 Awzdânava.
16 Kâçova.	16 Bawri	
17 Ushidâo.	17 Kvirinta	
	18 Kaôiriça.	

this mostly on the grounds of the same data, and it will not, perhaps, be superfluous to explain the reasons of this curious phenomenon. I think I can discover it in the method which Herr Geiger has employed in his inquiry. This method is quite new, and consequently has not yet received the approbation of scholars. Its characteristic peculiarities appear to be the following: According to Herr Geiger's method we may admit, on the one hand, that the Avesta is comparatively a recently edited prayer-book which is not identical with the original Avesta, but, on the other hand, we may seek for geographical facts therein, and this in such a manner that we can infer them from the silence of the author, even when the author himself tells us expressly that he is purposely silent on many points. This method authorizes us after we have established the fact that the geographical knowledge of the Avesta people was by no means brilliant, and that, consequently it is not allowable to forcibly draw any comprehensive conclusions from the order or arrangement which obtains in the list of countries given in the Vendidad, although a strict examination of the same quite shakes our belief in the existence of any principle of arrangement. According to this method we may weaken the force of passages of the Avesta which contradict a theory to be defended, by the observation that "they prove nothing at all" (1); if two conjectures are *possible*, without, however, any reason to make the one more probable than the other, we may reject the one which speaks against the theory in question.(2) According to this method if a place appears to be situated in the West, we may demolish the arguments which support this view by several unfounded and mere

1. *Vateral. u. Zeitalt. d. Avesta* p. 322. 2. Ibid.

à priori possible conjectures(1); but if a locality undoubtedly lies in the West, it is sufficient to say it may be situated outside the boundaries of the Avesta people, in order to deny it all argumentative value.(2) Following this method we may appeal to the statements of tradition when they appear to confirm the thesis which we wish to defend(3); on the contrary we may appeal to a principle of arrangement in the list of countries—a principle which has not been established—and on the strength of it reject, without further proof, the accounts of tradition.(4) If for the author of a fragment of the Avesta a place lies in the East it signifies that for the Avesta this place was situated in Eastern Iran, but not that the author of the fragment was at the time of writing present in the West.(5) On the strength of the "complete picture" formed by this method, and the "importance" of the identification supported in this fashion, we can transfer a westerly sea to the East, in order that no "exception" shall be made.(6)

To this new method are to be ascribed the results at which Herr Geiger has arrived. My method is the old one. I have no system to defend, no preconceived theory to prove, even no general system of names of the Avesta countries to propose. Moreover, I attach very little importance to names,—we can name as we please, only in doing so we must include all the localities mentioned in the Avesta and which are certainly identified, and besides still admit that our sources of information do not permit us to fix precisely the boundaries of the Avesta countries.

---

1. p. 323. 1°. Chaêchaçta was situated perhaps "not within the territory of the old Iranians," "because it lies *in fact* even quite a considerable distance to the west from the country which forms the extreme boundary." (323) 2°. "Tschatschasta is perhaps a passing name." (323) 3°. "Chaêchaçta is perhaps in the *North-East*" (337.)

2. p. 324. 3. With reference to Frâzdânava p. 326, and respecting Kañha, 327 &c.

4. *Vaterl. u. Zeitalt, d. Avesta.* p. 335. 5. p. 330. 6. p. 338,

THE AGE OF THE AVESTA.

According to the opinion which was first expressed by Haug, Zarathushtra was born about the year B. C. 2000, and his name was even mentioned in the Veda in the form of Garadashti. If but one of these assertions can be proved we have gained an important basis for the determination of the age of the Avesta. Almost thirty years, however, have passed since then, and this question, although not at precisely the same point, is nevertheless not yet finally solved. Herr Geiger does not appear desirous of fixing the precise age of the Avesta, as Haug has done; at least with him there is not only no question of a definite year, he does not even venture to refer the Avestic civilization to a particular century, (1) although he ascribes this civilization to a very remote antiquity which he leaves to the fancy or the ingenuity of his reader to more closely determine. Thus for example, he knows that it is decidedly older than the Medo-Persian history,(2) that it stands in near relation to the civilization of the Rig-Veda,(3) and what, if possible, is still more important, that the period of the Avesta people belongs even to the Bronze age.(4) These conclusions are, in reality, not less precise than the conjectures of Haug, and appear also of greater interest for the history of the civilization of the ancients. However, before we accept them as historical facts I think it proper to submit to a thorough

1. *Vaterl. u. Zeitalt. d. Avesta* p. 385. 2. Ibid. 3. Ibid. p. 343. 4. Ibid. p. 353.

examination the proofs which have been brought forward in support of them.

The first argument is *à silentio*. We need not be specialists to understand it correctly and to estimate it for what it is worth. I am content to render it as faithfully as possible. The Avesta is a *prayer-book* which was taken *for liturgical* purposes from the great but far less special Avesta.(1) The latter must have had its origin in a pre-Achaemenian or even in a pre-Median epoch, and this because the prayer-book compiled therefrom : 1, makes no mention of a single one of the celebrated cities of the Median period with the exception of Ragha, whose high antiquity is thereby clearly proved; 2, because not a single one of the later common race-names is mentioned; it tells neither of the Persians, nor of the Parthians, nor of the Medes, but only of the Aryans ; 3, because it contains not a single historical notice of the struggle between the Medes and the Babylonians, of the rise of the Persians, of the prosperity and decline of the Persian empire under the dynasty of the Achaemenides, of the invasion of Alexander the Great which shook the whole East, of the States which arose on the ruins of the Alexandrian empire, or of the power of the Arsacides. (2)

The reply to this argument, which by the bye, asserts a great deal too much and consequently proves nothing at all, is sufficiently simple. The original Avesta may have contained much historical and geographical information,—on that point we may at most hazard many conjectures ; we know only for a certainty that our Avesta is a compilation therefrom for liturgical purposes ; as such notices do not appear indispensably necessary in such a manual, they are not found in it. That it

1. *Vaterl. u. Zeitalt. d. Avesta.* p. 317. 2. Ibid. p. 340.

was even far from the *intention* of the editors or authors to comprehend information of the kind is evident from the fact that they have preserved us no single historical notice even of such cities as they were obliged to mention—Bâkhdhi, Ragha, Babylon &c. Are we then authorized to conclude from this circumstance that the Avesta was composed before Babylon &c. had a proper history? Or rather, does it not follow that the Avesta in its present form touches on external circumstances only in passing, and this so far as they concern or explain the religious condition or tendencies of the people? Under these circumstances the *argumentum á silentio* has absolutely no value.

In my opinion this is the only admissible explanation of the absence of such information. We evidently possess only imperfect fragments of the original Avesta which in the time of the Sassanides were at last collected and edited. The editors have, without, doubt interpolated many things relatively modern, but amongst these interpolations not a single historical notice is found. It is, then, often very difficult to determine whether the occurrence of this or that passage in the Yashts or in the Vendidad is to be ascribed to the authors or to the latest editors, and it is doubly difficult to decide whether we are to attribute to the latter or to the former the absence of historical and geographical information. But if such information, in consequence of the aim which the later editors had in view, is not only not required, but is directly excluded, we are, I think entitled to ascribe the omission to them, and not perhaps to the original authors.

In the circumstance that with the exception of Ragha and Babylon, no mention is made of a single one of the cities

famous in the time of the Medes, Herr Geiger sees very curiously an argument in support of the high antiquity of Ragha, and consequently of the Avesta. I am, however, of the opinion that directly the contrary is thereby proved. Babylon—Bawri—is mentioned only a single time in the Avesta, and then as the abode of the mythical Dahâka,—the Dragon with three jaws; in Babylon Dahâka offers a sacrifice to Ardvi-Çûra that she may give him the necessary strength to depopulate the seven Karshvares of the earth. Thus we have here statements which for the author himself evidently bore a purely mythical character, and in respect to him had come down from ancient times, and Babylon is the city which is associated with these mythical events. The magnificent *rôle* of Babylon was thus even then played out, and its importance as a great Power a thing of the past—a myth.

2. The absence of race-names must naturally be explained in the same manner. Herr Geiger says indeed: "The religious and political opposition between these and the other races of the Iranian empire, particularly the Persians, must, at least once, naturally lead to the mention of these names."(1) We may direct attention to the contrary fact, that this opposition finds no expression in our Avesta, which circumstance is also quite intelligible at least to those who will not deny to the Magi, I do not say extraordinary political capacity or deep Oriental cunning, but simple intelligence to play their part, and to the later editors the ability to carry out their easy task. If, as I believe, the Medes acted as the official priests of the Persians, and then first gradually won disciples in Persia, they had no interest whatever in giving prominence to the

1. *Vaterl. u. Zeitalt. d. Avesta.*, p. 342.

opposition existing between their countrymen and other races, but, on the contrary, it was important for them to endeavour to remove it wherever possible. But as to what regards the last editing of the Avesta, Herr Geiger appears to have overlooked the important circumstance that it took place at a time when Magism had become the State religion, so that we must admit that, although in the original Avesta the political and religious antagonism between the Magi and the other Iranian races was actually mentioned, the last editors of the Avesta—who were certainly Magi—had important reasons to carefully destroy all traces of this opposition.

Herodotus informs us that the Medes were called Aryans, and this appellation, which we consequently might expect rather than any other in the Avesta, occurs in it often enough. Herr Geiger, however, does not allow this argument to have any value, for Herodotus, as he informs us, says "*Pàlai* calls them Aryans. In the time of Herodotus, that is in the 5th century, the designation was already antiquated or very much restricted in its use." (1) I might then inquire of Herr Geiger, why may we not equally well, and even better, lay the principal stress on *prὸs pántôn*,(2) for the passage runs *'ekaléonto dὲ pálai prὸs pantôn 'Arioi 'apikoménês dὲ Mêdeíês tês kolchìdos 'ex 'Athénôn 'es toùs 'Aríous toùtous metebalon hoῦtoi oῦnoma.* The unanimous testimony of later historians is not at all favourable to the supposition that the designation Aryans, especially as regards the Medes, was in the time of Herodotus, already antiquated or restricted in its use. It proves even the contrary. Every Eastern and Western historian of the Sassanide period tells us that the Magi even at that time everywhere described themselves as Aryans.

1. *Vaterl. und Zeitalt. d. Avesta*, p. 343. 2. VII. 62.

"Doubly strange," says Herr Geiger, "must be the absence of these names for those who wish to identify the Atharvans of the Avesta with the Median Magi." (1) By no means strange,—for there is quite an analogous case which, however, does not seem at all surprising to Herr Geiger. He himself tells us that even *in Aryan primitive times a fire priest* was understood by the word Atharvan; (2) he admits, likewise, that the authors of the Gâthâs had sufficient occasion to mention the Atharvans.(3) Notwithstanding which, the word Atharvan does not occur a single time in the Gâthâs. Are we, then, in order that we may in some degree save our logic, to draw the conclusion from the omission of these words in the Gâthâs, that the authors of the songs were not acquainted with the Atharvans, who were already organized in Aryan primitive times; and that the Gâthâs were composed even *previous* to the primitive times of the Aryans? If not, then, Herr Geiger's argument has absolutely no value.

What does he wish precisely to prove thereby? What does he expect to be able to deduce from the circumstance that the Avesta speaks neither of the Persians nor the Medes, bnt only of the "Aryans"? Here I willingly allow Herr Geiger himself to speak. "There can, however," he says, "be no mistake that by the designation 'Aryans' the Avesta people are brought into close relation *with the Aryans* of the Rig-Veda." (4)

We may, accordingly, boldly maintain that the Avesta was composed at a time when the Iranians were not yet sepa-

---

1. *Vaterl. und Zeitalt. d. Avesta.* p. 342. 2. *Ostiran. Kult.* p. 464.
3. Ibid. p. 465. 4. *Vaterl. und Zeitalt. d. Avesta* p. 340.

rated into various races,—at a time when there were neither Persians, Medes, nor Bactrians &c. We may, and even must, draw thence the somewhat singular conclusion, that the language of the Avesta is the original Iranian language. This will certainly be rather unexpected and possibly surprising information for philologists,—nevertheless this is not all. We are forced, likewise, to acknowledge that at that time, when the Iranians still constituted one single people, and had one single language, one of the most famous cities—the most famous, if we are to credit the Avesta–was Ragha,(1) that is to say, a West Iranian city.

If then the Aryans of the Avesta stood in strict relation with the Aryans of the Rig-Veda, how is the radical difference of religious, social, and political opinions which we observe between the Vedic Aryans and the Avesta people to be explained? With what astonishing rapidity must not the Iranian as well as the Avesta myths, views of the world, and religious dogmas and usages have been developed! Would it not be simpler to admit that the Avesta in its most original form was first composed a considerable time after the division of the Iranians into Persians and North-Iranians and the formation of the various Iranian dialects, and consequently a very considerable time subsequent to the separation of the Iranians from the Indians. It is self-evident that the development of an independent North Iranian mythology and of a particular body of legends, in itself demands a considerable period of time, which is to be measured by centuries rather than by decades; and if, notwithstanding, we are expected to conclude

1. *Vaterl. und Zeitalt. d. Avesta*, p. 340.

from this circumstance that the Avesta speaks only of the Aryans, but not of the Persians, the Medes &c., that it originated before the separation of the Iranians, it is obvious the same may be affirmed of such works as the Mainyo-i-khard, the Dinkart, the Behrâm-Yesht, the Arda-Viraf nâmeh and the Sad-der, since they all present the same marks of age.

It may, perhaps, be proper to admit that the Iranian people after they had separated into independent races continued to call themselves Aryans, and that they retained this designation up to the epoch of the Sassanides. We know, indeed, that Darius was proud of his Aryan descent, that the Thracians and Ossetes adopted this appellation, that the kings of the Sassanide dynasty represented themselves as Aryans and divided their subjects into Aryans and non-Aryans, and Herodotus, in the passage quoted above, informs us that the Medes even gave themselves the name of Aryans. To this it may be added, that the Magi had very good reason to put in the back-ground as much as posible the question of race, and to spare the sensitiveness of other races and peoples, which they certainly understood very well how to do, as, amongst others, Yasht XIII proves in the most striking manner. What, then, is more natural than that they should have employed a neutral designation which was held to be honourable by each individual race ?

The exclusive use of the designation Aryan cannot otherwise be explained, for if Herr Geiger is right, we must admit that the Avesta originated in the time of the *Indo-Keltish* unity, and this because the word *Airya* in the Avesta does not appear as a designation which differentiates two *Iranian* races, but as a name which distinguished the Avesta people from the Turanians and other non-Aryan races ; thus, for

example Yt. XIII. 143, where the Fravashis of the Turanians Çairimas, Çâinis, and Dâhis are invoked and commended. Putting together all these facts we may definitely affirm that the absence of race-names in the Avesta by no means authorizes us to suppose that the Avesta was written before the time of the division of the Iranians into races, since the omission of any reference to races can, and must be, satisfactorily explained in another way.

Let us now glance at the positive proofs which Herr Geiger brings forward for the high antiquity of the Avesta. They appear to me not more tenable than the negative ones. He appeals to the simple picture of the primitive economic conditions of the people which is displayed to us in every part of the Avesta, but more especially in the Gâthâs, from which he pronounces these latter to be decidedly older than the remaining portions. The civilization described in the Avesta is the civilization of peasants and shepherds, and consequently it must be very ancient; which opinion also gains probability from the fact that the four following objects were unknown to the Avesta people. 1. Salt and its use; 2. glass; 3. coined money; 4. iron; so that the Avesta people belonged to the Bronze age.(1)

1. As to what concerns the primitive economic conditions of the Avesta people, they have, in my opinion, been exaggerated by Herr Geiger, and it appears to me that the difference of time between the conditions described in the Gâthâs, and those which we find in the remaining portions of the Avesta is not so considerable. Herr Geiger endeavours to prove that the Gâthâ songs are older than the rest of the Avesta, principally by relying on their "personal character." I

1. *Vaterl. und Zeitalt. d. Avesta* p. 353.

consider it, nevertheless much simpler to explain the " personal character " of the Gâthâ songs—a character which other portions of the Avesta sometimes exhibit—by the circumstance that they are the only, in some measure, poetical pieces—and on that account their authors introduce the persons appearing therein as speaking and acting. But admitting the Gâthâs to be older than the rest of the Avesta the absolute antiquity of the Avesta would not thereby be at all proved. The contrary would still remain more than probable, for the dry, dull allegories which are everywhere met with in the Gâthâs are not precisely the characteristics of a fresh, youthful religion of half-nomads; we also find the Zarathushtrian legends in some portions of the Gâthâs already fully developed. See Yaçna XXIX.

" In the Gâthâs, " says Herr Geiger, " the Cow constitutes the central point of the economic life. This, however, can only be satisfactorily explained when we admit that the Cow was highly esteemed and honoured by the Gâthâ people, perhaps in the same manner as by the Aryans of the Rig-Veda, and that they devoted particular attention to its rearing and its care. "(1) I believe, nevertheless, that the honour of which the Cow is the object in the Gâthâs is not less freely given to it in the remaining fragments of the Avesta. Passages such as Yaçna X. 20, and Yt. XIV. 61, prove this: " Honour be to the Cow; praise be to the Cow; protection be to the Cow; nourishment and fodder be to the Cow "(2) The Cow has generally been highly prized by all Indo-Keltish people, by some even to the present day—and to fix the relative age of

1. *Vaterl. und Zeitalt. d. Avesta.* p. 348. 2. Compare also Yt. XIII. 2 where the importance of the Cow is likewise expressed.

the Gâthâ songs, or the absolute age of the Avesta, on the ground of this high estimation is, I think, not justifiable. Let us examine Herr Geiger's argument somewhat more closely. In a very primitive state of civilization amongst all Indo-Keltish peoples—even in the transition stage from the nomadic to the settled mode of life,—the Cow played a very prominent part. This rôle is also attributed to it in the Gâthâs, and consequently these songs come down to us from a time when those conditions were in vogue. We may, on the contrary, direct attention to the fact that in the later Avesta also, the Cow holds the same high position which it gets in the Gâthâs, although the former, according to Herr Geiger's opinion was composed at a time when the conditions were not quite so primitive. The Cow may certainly have been the central point in the economic life, even long before the time when the Avesta was written, as it remained also long after,—that the both events happened simultaneously is a mere assertion,—it is not an established fact. I agree with Herr Geiger when he states that the Gâthâ people appear to have cared much more for the breeding of cattle than for agriculture; this, however, can only serve as a proof that the civilization of the people was still tolerably primitive, but not that the time was very ancient. Why should the transition of the Gâthâ people from the nomad state to that of a settled mode of life have occurred before the period of Median history, whilst amongst other Iranian races it took place some thousands of years later?

It is known that cultivable land was by no means in superabundance in Iran. Excellent pasture grounds are often to be met with where the soil is quite unsuited to purposes of agriculture. We need only to concede, what indeed cannot be easily

disproved, that the difference between the Gâthâ people and the Gâthâ dialect, on the one hand, and the Avesta people and the language of the rest of the Avesta on the other, was rather a difference of place than one of time. In the nature of the country we thus find the natural explanation of the preference which was given to cattle-breeding over agriculture. There were always nomads in Iran near the settled population, they lived and worked there during the rise of the Gâthâ songs, and they are found there even at the present day. In the time of Herodotus four out of the ten Persian races were nomads(1), and in our own day, the nomads constitute the half of the whole population of the Persian empire (2).

"I refer here finally," says Herr Geiger, "to Roth's excellent Essay on the Calendar of the Avesta and the Gahanbar "(3). I, for my part, take the liberty of referring to, as I think, the more excellent reply of de Harlez with whose conclusions I willingly express my entire concurrence.

The lively interest which the authors of the Avesta manifest in agricultural affairs furnishes Herr Geiger with a new argument in favour of his theory. He cannot imagine how the Atharvans of the Achemenian, as well as of the post-Achemenian epoch can have so very much interested themselves in such matters, because at that time political projects and party questions stood very much in the foreground. (4) This means, in other words, that because some ambitious Magi mainly, if not exclusively, occupied themselves with political questions, all of them must have done so. For my part, I

1. Herod. I. 25. 2. *The Persian Empire* ; I cannot, unfortunately, quote the passage as I have not the book by me. 3. *Vaterl. und Zeitalt. d. Avesta.* p. 351. 4. *Vaterl. und Zeitalt. d. Avesta.* p. 344.

cannot imagine this to have been the case. If we wish to deny absolutely to the Magi or the Atharvans (should we prefer to call them by that name) an enlightened philanthropy or a narrow patriotism, we may at least give them credit for a correct intelligence of their own interest, and nothing further is needed to sufficiently explain their agricultural tendencies. Their welfare was dependent on the material welfare of the whole people. The author of Yaçna XLVI. gives unmistakable proof of his political predilections which, however, did not prevent him from occupying himself with religious questions also. In a great corporation like the Atharvans, there were evidently persons of various tastes; together with ambitious politicians there were those who gave themselves to what was then the substitute for learning, and others who devoted their time and energy exclusively to religion. This phenomenon may be observed in all religious corporations at every period and in every country.

Herr Geiger's theory cannot naturally be easily reconciled with the supposition of the Magian descent of the Atharvans, and he has taken pains to advance a variety of arguments against this opinion. The Atharvans, he assures us, cannot possibly be identified with the Magi, because from these latter no longer speaks the genius of "a simple peasant and pastoral people such as it is characterized by the Avesta which should be the holy codex even of these Magi."(1) Does the Avesta, then, actually characterize this spirit? Are such dry, abstract conceptions as Ameretât, Haurvatât, Mãthra, Dâmivohumanô, Khshathra, Armaiti &c. the characteristics of the genius of a simple, homely, pastoral and peasant people? The Magi had

1. *Vaterl. und Zeitalt. d. Avesta*, p. 344.

likewise made much too great progress in civilization or in its bypaths, to call such poetical ideas into existence which only the fertile fancy of a young, fresh, pastoral and peasant people in the first dawn of civilization could have created and been able to express! *De gustibus non est disputandum.*

Is the politico-religious teaching of the Avesta that which we might expect from a homely, peasant people of the Bronze age? Herr Wilhelm who in a very weighty Essay has treated the question of the mutual relations between the Kingship and the Priesthood of old Iran, characterizes the views of the Avesta in this matter as follows:—"What therefore the Avesta aims at is a Hierarchy in which Zarathustra or his representative constitutes the chief or central figure. The most perfect therefore is a state such as Ragha where Zarathushtra or his representative is both High-Priest and sovereign Prince in the *one* person. But if both dignities are separated, the King or prince *(daŋhu-paiti)* is not the first but the second dignitary."(1) The politico-religious ideal of the Avesta—and in which all parts of the Avesta are at one—is thus a perfect Theocracy,—not perhaps a religion such as the Mazdian, with a priesthood subordinate to the political power, as we see in Persia in the time of the Achemenides, but an honourable Church, which consisted of a numerous spiritual hierarchy and a dutiful laity enjoying equal rights. Will it then be seriously maintained that such efforts to establish a Theocracy betray a plain, simple, peasant and pastoral people of the Bronze age? that such a people felt the necessity of spreading a politico-religious system which was so very artificial, before they were acquainted with the use of salt, or even in a condition to

1. *Konigthum und Priesterthum in alten Eran. Z. D. M. G. Bd.* XL. p. 107.

comprehend the advantages of agriculture? Herr Geiger, nevertheless, appears to think so, whilst on the other hand, he considers the Magi to have been too civilized to be regarded as the priests of the homely Avesta people. Herr Geiger bases his assertion, that the Avesta people were unacquainted with salt, on a single argument—the non-mention of salt in the Avesta. I have already given my opinion on the worth of such an argument, here I may only observe that, as Herr Geiger himself informs us, the Home of the Iranians was very proper to lead the people to the use of salt. It is found there in abundance and in every variety. In many desert tracts it covers the ground in the form of a white crust. Salt seas are not rare, salt steppes and strata of rock salt are found very frequently,—in short, "everywhere we meet this shining mineral so indispensable in daily life." (1) And in spite of all this, is it permissible to draw the conclusion from the non-mention of it in the Avesta, that a homely pastoral and peasant population were unacquainted with it, although they possessed the skill of charcoal burners, and had carried the healing art so far that those who wished to exercise it had first to submit to an examination? How will the question stand if we make a further use of this argument, and will maintain that because bridges are spoken of in the Avesta but no mention is made of boats or ships, these latter were unknown, and this remarkable peasant people were accustomed to swim across the rivers and seas whenever neither fords nor bridges were available?

The non-mention of glass, if it should actually appear that the Avesta nowhere speaks of it, can be explained by the prin-

1. *Ostiran, Kultur.* p. 149.

cipal object which the editors of our Avesta had in view. It seems, however, *a priori* improbable that a people who stood in close relation with Babylon, and who founded the city of Ragha, knew nothing of glass; that there was no extensive use of it proves nothing, for even centuries after the time when the Avesta was written glass cups or goblets were still costly rarities. Neither must we forget that the signification of the famous *zemaini pachicat* (Vend. VIII. 84) is yet by no means placed beyond doubt.

Coined money might also have been current without its being necessarily mentioned in the Avesta. Arguments of this kind should never have been advanced, for they serve but to weaken an already radically weak thesis. Supposing that the Avesta people made little use, or even none at all, of coined money, would this circumstance strengthen Herr Geiger's theory that the Avesta was composed in a pre-Median epoch? Certainly not, for if coined money in Iran was first struck off in the time of Darius Hystaspes, its use could not possibly have become general fifty years later in the whole empire. Could the people—a peasant and pastoral people—in the course of this short space of time have become so familiar with coinage that they reckoned fines, taxes, &c. according to this newly established system, and not as they had paid earlier with cattle, sheep, and horses? An affair of this kind does not come about so quickly now-a-days, even when there is merely question of a change in the ordinary coinage system, much less still in the time of the Achemenians before which period no coinage system existed in Iran. Some years ago when the South German coinage was altered, the change encountered difficulties of all kinds;—it was only after several

years that many inhabitants of the villages and even of the smaller towns accustomed themselves to the innovation, and there are perhaps even at this day South Germans who continue to reckon in gulden and kreuzern instead of marks and pfennigs. Even twenty-five years ago there were peasants in Ireland for whom coined money was the greatest rarity, and who to the end of their days could not tell the value of the various coins and Bank notes in circulation. Barter took the place of sale and purchase ; even agricultural hiring was paid in kind. The physician as well as the priest received sheep, fowl, hay, corn, fuel, or labour. Nevertheless, Herr Geiger is astonished we should seriously believe that the Magi of the Achemenian period can have accepted payment in sheep, oxen, or horses.(1)

Let us now turn to Herr Geiger's question : How were the Magi of the Sassanide period paid ? Doubtless in most cases in money.(2) However, as a basis for all such calculations the tariff of the Vendidad was employed ; the value of horses, cattle, and sheep was reckoned and the corresponding sum was paid in current coin. The circumstance that the old tariff existed and was still employed in the time of the Sassanides cannot serve as a proof that they were then unacquainted with a coinage system, for such a conjecture is contradicted by history. May it not, then, have been the same case at an earlier period ? Can the tariff of the Vendidad at the close of the Achemenian epoch have had the same limited importance which it had in the fifth century of our era ? The Iranians had a blood-tax before the rise of Zarathushtra, which

1. *Vaterl. u. Zeitalt. d. Avesta.* p. 357. 2. Compare Casartelli, *Un Traite Pehlevi sur la Medecine*, Museon, tom. V, n. 3, p. 305.

no doubt was reckoned in cattle, sheep, &c. Later on when a system of coinage was introduced the old tariff was retained. Thus the non-mention of money in the Avesta throws absolutely no light on the age of the book. We need not even go far to find an illustration. If we read the "Adaten" (or "Customs") of the Caucasian people, a work not long since published in Russia, we shall find the same phenomenon,—fines or penalties are all reckoned in natural products. Thus for example we read in the Adaten of the Ossetes § 112. For the blood of a Farsaglag(1) 30 cows are to be paid. § 114. For the blood of a Gurziak,(2) 30 cows are to be paid. § 115. If a man kills his wife he is to give to her relations half the number which he should pay for the murder of a man of a like condition. § 118. He who injures a guest shall pay to the host of the guest a horse and saddle, a sword and 18 cows. § 121. Whoever carries away a maiden shall pay to her father 85 cows. § 122. Whoever seduces the wife or daughter of another shall pay three swords and three horses.(3) We may observe the same in the "Adaten" of the Tschetschener. Thus for example. § 4. He who has killed another must pay 12 cows, but, besides, blood for blood is to be demanded which at the earliest opportunity is to be exacted. § 6. He who kills his childless wife is to pay to her relations 85 cows; but if his wife has already had children he is to pay only 12 cows.(4) In almost all "Adaten" the penalties are reckoned in the same way:—thus in the Dscherachischen, Nazranischen,

1. Member of the numerous class of Tagauren. By descent they are certainly not Tagauren; they belonged to other races but wandered hither, and were received in a friendly manner by the Tagauren.

2. Properly Georgians: but the Gurziaks were actually descended from people who were bought or captured by the Tagauren from other tribes. 3. *The Adaten of the Caucasian Mountaineers* (Russian) by F. I. Leontovitch; B. II p. 28-29. 4. Ibid p. 115.

Kistenischen, &c.(1) where coined money, but not silver, is mentioned. What does this prove for the age of these "Adaten"? Does it not throw great light on the penalties and Kurtax of the Avesta ?

But the question now arises—does the Avesta really make no mention of money ? For my part I am inclined to regard the word *shaeta* as a proof of the contrary. In this opinion I do not stand alone, for Herr Tomaschek has expressed himself in the same sense.(2) But there is yet another word *açperena (açperenô-mzaô)* which is certainly to be considered as a word indicating value. According to the general opinion of Avesta inquirers *açperena* was a coined piece of inconsiderable value. This appears from the use of the word in the Avesta, but is further confirmed by the Pehelvi translation. Herr Geiger admits all this, but immediately adds that *açperena* is a Semitic borrowed word and he points to the existence of a similar case (*manâ*) in the Rig Veda, as if this entered into consideration for the decision of the question on which we are employed. Finally Herr Geiger ingeniously remarks: "We *might* in both cases erase the sentence or the expression without thereby in any way destroying the sense of the whole."(3) But are we to do so, and wherefore ? If we would erase all that might be omitted without the sense of the whole being thereby destroyed, we could indeed prove much, but certainly not that the Avesta had its origin "in a pre-Median epoch." If the passages in which the word *açperena* occurs are interpolated, it only remains to prove the fact—each one will then strike them out.

---

1. Ibid p. 116 *et. seq.* 2. *Ausland* 1833. p. 825.

3. *Vaterl. u. Zeit. d. Avesta*, p. 361. I have myself italicized the word "might."

As regards iron, it has by no means been decided that the Avesta nowhere speaks of it, for the word *ayañh* which Herr Geiger translates by "ore" may have signified iron as well as ore. Nor must we lose sight of the fact that some peoples have had no particular Bronze-age as they commenced to work in both metals simultaneously. But when a people were acquainted with copper and worked in it before they were acquainted with iron, they sometimes continued for a long while to fabricate their weapons, household implements, &c, out of bronze whilst iron remained an object of *luxe*.

Finally I might remind Herr Geiger that the so-called Turanians who were very well known to the Avesta, were iron workers *par excellence*, and spread the use of this metal. Is it then antecedently probable that they did not make its use known in Iran? Herr Geiger himself informs us: "The Central Asian mountain ranges are rich in iron ore, and its existence in the Hara is established(1) by our Texts."(2)

The word *ayañh* occurs with sufficient frequency in the Avesta, (Yaçna IX. 11 twice; XI. 7; XXXII. 16; LI. 9; Yt. X. 16, 132; XIII. 3; XIX. 40; Vend. V. 38.) In Yaçna IX. 11 it has no qualification; Geldner, it appears to me, translates it correctly by iron ("in an iron cauldron.")(3) In Yaçna XI. 7, it is likewise unaccompanied by any qualification, but may very well be translated by "iron." De Harlez also translates it thus: "des liens de fer.") In Yaçna XXXII, 6 the Text gives *huvaena ayañh*.(4) Neriosengh renders it by *lohena* which we are entitled here to regard as iron. On this point I might call attention to the fact that the Sanscrit *loha* which

1 *Ostiran. Kult.* p. 147. 2. Yt. XV. 7. *paiti ayañh*. 3. *Die Metrik* p. 125. 4. I read *huvaena* instead of *gaena*, and connect it with *aen*, consequently I translate it "brilliant."

at first received the signification of "reddish," later on meant copper as well as iron. De Harlez translates it by "fer aigu." In Yaçna LI. 9 we read *ayaṅha khshuçta*, a qualification which Herr Geiger will hardly claim in support of his opinion. Justi translates it by "molten (iron)"(1); de Harlez, renders it by "l'acier vibrant." Khshuçta probably signifies liquid, here, probably, molten.(2) In Yt. X. 96 we find *Zarōis ayaṅhō frahiktem*, where in my opinion, *ayaṅha* cannot mean iron, but either metal in general, or ore. In one place Justi translates this passage by "overlaid with yellow metal "(3) and in another "covered with yellow ore."(4) I consider both translations to be correct. De Harlez has "*revetue d' un metal jaune*," on account of the epithet or qualification "*yellow*" it must be doubtlessly be regarded as standing for ore rather than for iron. The same may be asserted of Yt. X. 132 where it appears with the same adjective. In Yt. XIII. 3 we read *ayaṅho kehrpa qaenahe raochahinō avi thrishva* where it may be translated equally well,—indeed better, by ore than by iron. In Yt. XIX. 40, *ayaṅho* which occurs directly in the same context as in Yaçna IX. 11 is likewise to be translated by "iron cauldron." In Vendidad V. 38 occurs *ayaṅhecha* also without an epithet. Here it is said that the *Ashemaogha* robbed the pure believers of all earthly goods, as for example provisions, clothing &c, under which head we find *ayaṅh*. I am disposed to regard it in this instance as the general description for metal; in any case I see no reason to prefer any particular metal, and to affirm that it is such metal is here spoken of.

---

1. *Handb. d. Zendspr. sub voce.* 2. Compare Yt. XVII. 20, Visp. XX. 1. Yt. II. 7, &c. 3. *Handbuch*, 202. (2) 4. Ibid. 118.

From what has been said it is evident that *ayañh* has three significations in the Avesta: Metal in general, bronze, and iron. The Sanscrit *ayas* denotes both metal in general and iron; or if we prefer another example *loha* which signifies both bronze and iron. If then ayañh in one place probably signifies bronze, must it be so translated, and only so in every case. Neither are we to forget that the myth of iron occurs everywhere in the Iranian legends, and that the discovery of iron is placed in a very remote antiquity. Thus for example in the Bundehesh (chap. XV.) it is related that the *first men* dug a hole in the earth in which they found iron and that they worked the newly-discovered metal by strokes of the hammer. This tradition is faithfully preserved by Firdusi also, for he ascribes the softening of iron to the fabulous Yima. I believe that the following consideration is not entirely devoid of importance: the old religious customs and ceremonies of the Zoroastrians have in the main been faithfully preserved even to the present day, they are adhered to as strictly as possible, and the smallest change or variation is not permitted without grave reasons. In all such matters the Zoroastrians have been exceedingly conservative. Anquetil reports that the modern Ateshdan is of copper, as it has been probably from the commencement. But it is not so with all instruments. In Vend. IX. 14, we read *ayañhaenam vā çrumvā* which I translate by "iron spoon or ladle." Anquetil, however, assures us that this spoon or ladle is still manufactured of iron,(1) as is also the bed whereon the unclean woman is to rest.(2) There is consequently but little danger of our erring, if we assume that these objects have, from primitive times, been made of iron.

1. Tome III. 547. 2. Ibid. 563.

Hence it is more than doubtful that the Avesta people were unacquainted with the use of salt, glass, iron, and coined money. This would in itself—and abstracting from the testimony of the Avesta—be very improbable, for the Avesta is originally the codex not so much of the primitive Iranians, but of a single Iranian tribe who were exposed to the continued influence of Semitic neighbours, and it was only after this influence had borne abundant fruit that the Avesta could possibly have originated. Mazdaism and Zoroastrianism are two very different—and at times—opposite systems, and a greater factor in the rise of the latter was this Semitic influence. If we read carefully the history of its development, as related by Spiegel or de Harlez, and calculate the time necessary for such development after the division of the Iranians into tribes, we cannot, I think, admit that the Avesta can possibly have had so early an origin as Herr Geiger conjectures.

The Babylonians were acquainted with salt, and made use of it; they manufactured glass tiles long before Zarathushtra made his appearance in Iran; they also understood how to work in iron; Herr Geiger does not deny this, nor has he offered any objection to a connexion of Babylon with Ragha. If, then, the influence of Babylon on one of the oldest of Zoroastrian cities is beyond doubt— if this influence must have made itself felt in every department of life at that period, how can we, without any reason, for the silence of the Avesta, if such silence is assured, is no reason whatever—limit the range of this influence? Whether salt, iron &c. are mentioned or not in the Avesta, does not affect the question. If we open the Old Testament we find that amongst the prophets Sophonias, Joel, Abdias, Nahum, Habakuk, Malachi and probably in other books of the Bible, there is nowhere

mention of iron, glass, or money, although we might much sooner expect mention of them there than in the Avesta.

As to what regards the positive proofs which support the opinion that the Avesta was written in the commencement of the Achemenian period, I consider it superfluous to more closely explain them, since Herr Geiger has nowhere refuted them; I merely refer to the discussions of Spiegel (*Eran Alt.*) and de Harlez (*Les Origines du Zoroast.* and the *Introduction.*)

The Persians of the Achemenian period were, in my opinion, Mazdians; they believed in Ahura-Mazda, and appear to have had many things in common with the Avesta people generally. After the separation of the Aryans, and the emigration of the Iranians, these latter needed at least some centuries in order to elaborate their peculiar myths and views of the world, before Mazdaism could have arisen, and been developed as we see it in the time of the Achemenians. It was only after all this had taken place that Zoroastrianism, which was nothing else than a reform of Mazdaism, could have come into existence. Hence Zarathushtra was not originally the national reformer of Iran, but the prophet of a single Iranian race,—as, I think, of the Median. From this race, however, the Zarathushtrian doctrine spread gradually through the whole of Iran. Consequently the religious dogmas and views of the Avesta consist of three different strata: 1. of a stratum common to all Indo-Keltish peoples; 2. of a definite Iranian, and 3. of a specific Avestic or Zarathushtrian stratum. Hence to admit as Spiegel does(1) that some portions of the Avestic system date from a time even earlier than the

1. *Eran. Alterthum*, p. 447.

Achemenian epoch by no means implies that the Avesta must be older than the Achemenian period. The Persians of the time of Darius Hystaspes were certainly Mazdians, as were also the great mass of the Iranians. They became Zarathushtrians only after the decline of the Achemenian dynasty, although it is extremely difficult to fix the precise epoch. It is thus possible that there were more than one Zarathushtra, by which circumstance the complications and contradictions of the Zoroastrian legends are to be explained.

00051165

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 15 June, 2016